

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 979, Vol. 38.

August 1, 1874.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

SPAIN.

THE partisans of either side in the Spanish Civil War have lately occupied with controversy an interval during which military operations seem to have been suspended. Foreign supporters of the Carlist cause have probably endeavoured to impress on their principals at the seat of war the inexpediency of bloodthirsty proclamations and of the execution of prisoners in cold blood. It is perhaps for the purpose of humouring vulgar prejudice that DORREGARAY's menaces against the enemy are declared to be forgeries, and that the Republican prisoners who were condemned to death after the battle of Estella are found to have been engaged in burning houses for the purpose of destroying their inmates. It may be admitted that the evidence of the atrocities attributed to the Carlists is not unimpeachable. Spanish journalists are in the habit of using strong language; and if facts damaging to enemies are not forthcoming, it is not unlikely that they may be invented. The main presumption against the Carlists is derived from their traditions and from the equanimity with which they have allowed statements of their cruelty to be circulated and believed. It seems hopeless to ascertain the truth of the conflicting accounts of the latest events in the Civil War. Don ALFONSO forced his way into Cuenca after a contest of two or three days with a scanty garrison, and it is asserted that his troops were deliberately allowed after their victory to sack the town. A force sufficient for the relief of Cuenca was within reach at the time when the disaster might have been prevented, but two officers of rank took the opportunity to quarrel as to their right to command, and consequently no movement was made until the town had been taken. The captors made no attempt to hold the place; and on their retreat they were attacked and defeated by General LOPEZ PINTO, with the loss of all their prisoners and booty. Great alarm had been caused at Madrid by a Carlist victory obtained in the province of Valencia to the south-east of the capital; but the flight and defeat of Don ALFONSO indicate the weakness of a force which probably consists only of undisciplined volunteers; and perhaps little attention is paid to the assertions of the Carlist press, that no such victory had been obtained. One good result of the affair at Cuenca is the appointment to high command of two of the best officers at the disposal of the Government. General LOPEZ DOMINGUEZ had the credit of reducing Carthage; and it is supposed that, notwithstanding his near relation to SERRANO, he has since been kept in the background on account of his sympathies with the son of Queen ISABELLA. General PAVIA sternly repressed a series of local rebellions in the Southern cities of Spain at a time when the country had been reduced almost to utter anarchy by the blunderers and traitors who exercised power at Madrid between the abdication of AMADEO and the accession of CASTELAR to office. PAVIA is also the founder of the actual Provisional Government which, with all its faults, has for some months preserved order in the interior, and which has made some progress in the indispensable work of reorganizing the army.

General PAVIA has, like military commanders in several countries, turned a Legislature out of doors at the point of the bayonet, with the singular good fortune of neither incurring nor deserving any moral blame. The Republican Spanish Cortes, having been elected by a factious minority, proved itself utterly incompatible with the establishment of a regular Government. CASTELAR had been enabled partially to restore order by proroguing the Cortes during

nearly the whole term of his Administration, and, as soon as he imprudently allowed the Legislature to reassemble, he was left in a minority. General PAVIA, as Captain-General of Madrid, seized the opportunity of saving the country from imminent ruin, and, having dismissed the Cortes, he refused to accept Ministerial office. At a later period he resigned his military post because the Chief of the Executive dismissed the Ministers who represented a coalition of parties. There is reason to hope that General PAVIA, when he is provided with the necessary force, will prosecute the campaign against the Carlists in earnest. If peace were once re-established, it would matter comparatively little whether the Provisional Government were maintained for a time, or the BOURBON Pretender were placed on the throne. For the present, at least, the country must necessarily be governed by the military chiefs who can insure the obedience of the army. As President of the Republic, or as Minister of a young and titular King, SERRANO or his successor will not allow themselves to be hampered by incapable and factious Assemblies, although for particular purposes they may occasionally summon a Cortes consisting of docile partisans. A real Republic has probably become, during the present generation, impossible, through the follies and crimes of the Republicans themselves; but the title which the Government may assume is comparatively unimportant. The present Government appears to be impressed with the urgency of its primary duty. Orders have been issued for calling out reserves to the number of 125,000 men; and although experience has shown the inefficiency of raw recruits, the troops in the field must be gradually acquiring habits of discipline, and after an interval it may be found possible to overwhelm the Carlists by force of numbers.

One crime which has been undoubtedly committed by the Carlists was at the same time a blunder. Their apologists loudly assert that Captain SCHMIDT, who was shot by judgment of a court-martial, was justly condemned because he was found within the Carlist lines. It is utterly incredible that a German officer of reputation, engaged as a newspaper Correspondent with the national army, should have acted as a spy. In the rapid retreat from Estella it was highly probable that a non-combatant might be unable to accompany the army to which he was attached; and that he might therefore be taken prisoner within the limits of the positions which had been reoccupied by the pursuing troops. It will be impossible to convince either his countrymen or impartial foreigners of other nations that Captain SCHMIDT was put to death for any other reason except that he was a German and a Protestant. There are fanatics in the Carlist army who probably believe that the German Government is the chief enemy of the orthodox Church, and to a Spaniard an alien is almost equivalent to an enemy. The murder of an officer who voluntarily exposed himself to the risk of war would not perhaps furnish a sufficient reason for reprisals or for intervention, but the German Government has a long arm, and it was rash to incur its just displeasure and resentment. To the present time the Government of Berlin has carefully abstained from participation in the domestic troubles of Spain. A German naval officer who took possession of armed vessels then in the hands of the insurgents was promptly disavowed and recalled. The rumour that a German candidate for the Crown of Spain was again to be proposed originated in French ingenuity, and it found little credence even in Spain. It is now announced that a German squadron is again to cruise in Spanish waters, though the additional

statement that it will intercept the Carlist supplies is probably unfounded. Although there is no chance of military intervention, it is probable that the diplomatic influence of Germany will henceforth be used in support of the Government of Madrid. One measure which would add greatly to the strength of the national Government would consist in diplomatic recognition by the Great Powers; and if Germany were to propose such a measure, it is highly probable that other Governments would be ready to concur.

After the abdication of King AMADEO the prospects of the Republic were wholly uncertain; and as all the Governments of Europe agreed in withholding recognition, it may perhaps be assumed that they had sufficient reason for their common action. A nominal Republic has now lasted for a year and a half, and the Provisional Government of SERRANO for six or seven months. It is uncertain whether any definitive Constitution or form of government will be established for many years; and Marshal SERRANO can produce the best of all credentials in the acquiescence of all parties outside the district occupied by the Carlists in his exercise of authority. If the Government of Madrid were formally recognized, the Carlists would be reduced to their true position as rebels; and although the policy of interference which prevailed thirty years ago has been wholly abandoned, only a few religious and political enthusiasts, except perhaps in France, fail to desire the early suppression of the insurrection. It is a sufficient reason for desiring the triumph of the national Government that the Carlists have no chance of complete and ultimate success. It is better that the wrong side should win than that civil war should be perpetual; and in this case the Government of Madrid is not on the wrong side. It may be hoped that there is no foundation for a rumour, not in itself improbable, that Marshal SERRANO has been advised by the English Government to facilitate recognition by convoking a Cortes to confirm his title. Constitutional principles recommend the reference of all important questions to representative Assemblies, but Spain is not in a condition to profit by constitutional principles, because, among other reasons, the Cortes which are successively elected represent little except the policy and interests of the party in power. The real reason for recognizing a Government is not that it is constitutional or free, but that it possesses a *de facto* existence. Lord PALMERSTON was justly blamed for the undue haste with which he recognized the Presidency of Prince LOUIS NAPOLEON after the expulsion of the National Assembly in December 1851; but, if he had waited for two or three months, the approval of the vast majority of the French nation would have rendered recognition both justifiable and necessary. Foreigners ought, while they acknowledge indisputable facts, to avoid all responsibility for the policy of Governments over which they have no control. If the Spaniards think fit to submit to a Government which was appointed by an officer who had just before turned his Cortes out of doors, it is not the business of Englishmen to question their discretion. If the German Government proposes the recognition of Marshal SERRANO's Government, Lord DERBY and his colleagues ought to listen favourably to the suggestion. The consent of France, though much to be desired, is not absolutely indispensable.

PUBLIC WORKS IN INDIA.

THE debate in the House of Commons on Lord SALISBURY's Bill for appointing a member of the Indian Council specially charged with the supervision of public works seemed on the point of being diverted into a side issue of very minor importance. Mr. FAWCETT wished the Bill to stand over until Parliament had been informed whether Lord NORTHBROOK approved of it. If this meant that one more opinion was to be added to that of statesmen of Indian experience, the House was invited to delay a Government Bill for a very small object. If it meant that the opinion of the GOVERNOR-GENERAL was to be set against that of the SECRETARY of STATE, the House was invited to abandon such slight control over Indian affairs as Parliament possesses. As it happened, those who were in Lord NORTHBROOK's confidence were able to assert that he did not wish to bias in any way the decision at which Parliament might arrive. It may be conjectured that his own leaning was slightly against the measure, but that he felt how much was to be said on both sides, and he thought this peculiarly a case in which the SECRETARY

of STATE must judge for himself. Although, however, the debate turned too much on the question of what Lord NORTHBROOK's opinions might possibly be, yet sufficient attention was paid to the main issue to strengthen very considerably the case on which Lord SALISBURY relies. On the amount expended on public works, and on the degree of wisdom with which that expenditure is directed, depends the security or insecurity of Indian finance, and a sound financial position is the key to good government in India as everywhere else. The Secretary of State is responsible for the good government of India, and he has to see that the financial position of India is sound. But the expenditure on public works is continually deranging the financial position of India, and then, when the Secretary of State wants to see why things are going wrong, he finds that no one is responsible. There is no particular person on whom blame can be laid, or who can be instructed to persevere in one uniform policy when matters involving a vast variety of detail have to be dealt with. Perhaps Lord SALISBURY scarcely insisted with sufficient strength on this aspect of the Bill when he spoke on the second reading. At any rate, Lord NAPIER in his letter to the *Times* failed to notice what was the real justification of the measure, and of the mode in which it has been introduced. It is really a measure for the protection and benefit of the SECRETARY of STATE, who requires a new piece of machinery created for him if he is to discharge with effect the duties of his position. It was not for him to be guided on such a point by his Council in England, or to be guided too completely by the opinions of any one Governor-General. He appeals to Parliament to help him to discharge duties which Parliament has imposed on him, and the question lies between the body that imposed the responsibility and the Minister on whom it is laid. That Lord NAPIER should have written his letter at all, and especially that he should have written a letter to be printed just on the eve of the discussion in the Commons, seems to have been viewed with considerable displeasure in Ministerial circles. The proper place for a peer to tell the public what he has to say on a Bill is, no doubt, the House of Lords. But then, as Lord NAPIER explains, the hour was late when the Bill came on, and the House was perfectly empty. Peers would not bother themselves about going down at an hour when they are more pleasantly engaged to hear a dreary debate about India. Those who wish to speak are discouraged and disheartened at the gloomy silence and lonely emptiness that is before them; and they know that so little attention is paid to debates in the House of Lords when the House is empty and the hour late, that the reporters cut down all that is said into a few brief and almost unmeaning sentences. To speak in the House of Lords under such circumstances is the very worst way which a peer well acquainted with a special subject could choose for gaining the ear of the public. To get a letter in large print into the *Times* is the very best. It is not unnatural, though it is not very decorous, if a peer prefers the course which Lord NAPIER adopted; and if blame is to be bestowed, it must not be bestowed on Lord NAPIER alone, but the House of Lords must come in for a share, and a very large share, of it.

As Lord GEORGE HAMILTON observed, the best justification of the Bill was to be found in Lord NAPIER's description of the present system. A scheme for public works is conceived by the Local Department of Public Works and commended to the Local Government. The Local Government sanctions it, and the Local Executive officer prepares estimates, which are corrected by the Superintendent Engineer. The scheme is next sent to the Public Works Department of the province, and this department sends it on to the Council of the province. It is then submitted to the Supreme Government, and, if approved, is referred to the Consulting Engineer and Secretary, who are empowered to sanction it. As the UNDER-SECRETARY asked, if the scheme turns out to be a bad one, who of all these numerous authorities is to be held responsible? No doubt the Viceroy is in a sort of way responsible, but the responsibility attaching under such circumstances to a person like the Viceroy is merely nominal. He has no one who is responsible to him, and if the Government at home approves of his policy generally, it cannot take him to task for a mistake into which he has been betrayed by a vast array of subordinates, and which he will probably regret as keenly as any one. How powerless the Secretary of State is, if he tries to find out who is to blame, may be inferred from a

common piece of Indian history to which Lord GEORGE HAMILTON referred. Some waterworks at Madras had proved a great failure, and the Duke of ARGYLL thought he had hit on the right person to reprimand, and wrote a severe censure on the Executive Engineer. But the Madras Government wrote back that at the time when the Madras Waterworks project was brought forward there was no one whose special duty it was to examine its several bearings, and to take care that all requisite information was duly obtained and reviewed. The Duke of ARGYLL wrote back in unfeigned astonishment to say that he had been under the impression that the special duty referred to devolved in all cases not on one person only, but on a whole series of authorities. The Madras Government replied that this was exactly what it meant. The special duty did fall on a whole series of authorities, and so, if it was neglected, there was no one person to blame. The same thing happens from first to last; there is a whole series of authorities to blame, so no one is to be blamed, or cares in the least whether a scheme turns out ill or well. What Lord SALISBURY insists on is that there shall be some one to blame, some one who shall feel personal responsibility, and above all some one who is placed high enough to perceive the intimate connexion between Indian finance and Indian public works. It is quite true that in India the most carefully-prepared estimates often prove erroneous, either through the convulsions of nature or through changes in the price of labour. But, in the first place, a high official on whom real responsibility devolved would be at liberty to show that causes had intervened which could not be foreseen, and that therefore no blame was to be attached to him or to any one else; and, in the next place, a member of Council who has before him the general scheme of Indian finance will be aware that he need not think of sanctioning an expenditure on public works without leaving himself a margin on which he may draw, if unforeseen causes of increased expenditure should unfortunately show themselves.

Lord NAPIER was much disgusted with the thought that the new member of Council and the Secretary of the Public Works Department might come into collision, and then he wanted to know what was to happen. It might be the case that if the member of Council was an engineer, the Secretary might be the abler engineer of the two, and thus his superior competency would put to shame the inferior capacities of his chief; or, if the member of Council was a civilian, he would be at the mercy of his nominal subordinate. Something of the sort happens constantly in England. A new Minister is put at the head of a department of the working of which he knows nothing, and he has to deal with a permanent official who knows everything about his own office. If the Parliamentary chief is at all fit for his place, he listens to the permanent official, uses the information he gains from him, asks for his friendly co-operation, and then decides for himself. Exactly the same thing will happen in the Public Works Department of India if the right man is appointed to the new post. He will learn all he can from the Secretary, and yet keep the Secretary in his proper place. If of all men alive the Secretary is the best man to judge what should be the expenditure on public works, and in what way the money should be expended, he ought clearly to be the new member of Council. If there is a better man to be found, the Secretary must be content with his subordinate position. But it is not really the function of the new member of Council to show a superiority in questions of engineering over every one else in India. His business is to see that Indian public works do not derange Indian finance. He can scarcely be too cautious. Every speaker in the House of Commons debate protested against extravagant expenditure on public works. It is now recognized that India is a very poor country in proportion to its population, and that the limits of possible taxation have been apparently reached for the moment. India cannot afford failures in gigantic engineering undertakings. Mr. FAWCETT certainly went too far when he said that it was unjust to tax the whole of India to make up a deficit caused by improvident expenditure in any one part as it would be to tax the whole of Europe to make up a deficit caused by improvident expenditure in Russia. When money has to be expended by the State, either for the general purposes of State, or in the construction of the railways on the North-West frontier,

which are nothing but instruments of war, all India must pay just as all India pays for the army. When, again, money has to be laid out to avert calamities such as famine which the State alone can avert, all India must pay because every part partakes, or may need to partake, of the benefits of this species of insurance. But when a work is undertaken because it is supposed that it will add to the wealth of a particular locality and pay its own expenses, the locality that is benefited ought to make up any deficiency which may arise from an incorrect estimate of the probable return for the expenditure. If it is said, as in many cases it may be said truly, that there is no way of making the benefited locality pay in this case, then this is only an additional reason for taking care that money shall not be spent on works that are supposed to be likely to be reproductive until such evidence has been accumulated of their probable reproductiveness as will establish that, if a responsible official errs, he has only erred where the most prudent man acting on the amplest information might have made the mistake. What Lord SALISBURY wants is to have one definite person who will have to establish this if he is to escape censure; and if anything can save Indian finance from being deranged by Indian public works, the creation of such an official ought to do much to bring about a result which is so very desirable.

FRENCH FINANCE.

FOR many weeks it appeared as if there was a deficit in the French Budget of two millions sterling which it was impossible to fill up. M. MAGNE insisted that it must somehow be filled up, and the Assembly quite agreed with him. Every one concurred in the opinion that a deficit of two millions was not a thing that could be tolerated. But as to the mode in which it was to be filled up there was an infinite diversity of opinions. M. MAGNE racked his brains to invent new taxes or additions to old ones, but in vain. The difficulty was that the returns seemed to show that to augment the indirect taxes would be simply to check consumption. Consumers had only a certain amount of money to lay out, and if they were asked to pay more for each article, they would simply buy fewer articles. M. MAGNE therefore conceived that to increase the direct taxes was the right method, or else to impose a new duty on something like salt which the poorest people must buy. The Assembly would not fall in with his schemes. It thought that the direct taxes were already exceedingly high in proportion to the indirect taxes, and it feared the inevitable unpopularity which would attach to those who increased the duty on salt. The objections to every tax proposed were sound and intelligible, but then the deficit remained uncovered. M. MAGNE professed himself utterly unable to answer the question how it was to be covered, and therefore the Assembly proceeded to answer it for him. It adopted a proposal made by M. WOŁOWSKI, that two millions should be procured by the easy method of not paying it. The State had undertaken to repay the Bank its advances during the war by yearly instalments of eight millions sterling. If the Bank had only six millions instead of eight, the two millions so long and painfully sought for would be found at once. The process seems so easy that many English critics have asked why, if two millions could be found in this way, six millions more should not be found in the same way, and thus the heavy burden of taxation lightened by a very sensible amount. What, it is asked, is the good of repaying the Bank at all? It does not, so far as its mere immediate trading interests are concerned, care whether it is repaid or not. It lends its money at one per cent., but it enjoys the privilege of an enormously increased note circulation. Its financial position is exceedingly strong, as it has nearly fifty millions of bullion and coin in its vaults, and it can get on perfectly well even if the State does not think proper to make it any reimbursements. The Assembly, however, did not go so far as this. It held to the doctrine that the Bank must be reimbursed, and reimbursed out of current proceeds of taxation. The only change it made was that it decided that, instead of eight millions being paid for six years, six millions should be paid for eight years. It was ready to pay all that could be paid; but it was of opinion that there was no increase of taxation that would be endurable to France, and that therefore it must be content with paying a smaller sum than had been at first agreed on.

This was a very different thing from abandoning the arrangement made by M. THIERS for the reimbursement of the Bank loan. It was no necessary departure from the principles on which that arrangement had been made. It only varied the period in which the object aimed at by M. THIERS would be accomplished, and it varied it very slightly. The difference between eight years and six is trifling in the history of a country like France. And yet M. MAGNE, rather than assent to the new arrangement, resigned. He would not be minister any longer if eight years was substituted for six. It may be true that at the close of the struggle his authority was so much impaired by a direct vote against him that his position was made untenable. But he could, if he pleased, have saved himself by adopting a little earlier the suggestion which he knew would be made, and which he must have been well aware would receive a great amount of support. If the expedient of paying the Bank two millions less was so simple, so wise, and so just, it seems strange that he did not fall in with it. He had every motive for doing so, as he had a considerable financial reputation to sustain, which would necessarily be impaired if he could not see what the rest of the world saw plainly, and if he was to leave office, he knew that he was leaving it at a moment most inconvenient to his political friends. M. MAGNE's obstinacy about these two millions has in fact proved ruinous to the Bonapartists for the moment, and it is scarcely likely therefore that he can have been obstinate except on what seemed to him most substantial grounds. A suggestion was made some little time ago that the whole scheme of repaying the Bank by instalments was a cunning device of M. THIERS, in order to prepare France for another war. The French would get into the habit of paying eight millions a year more than was absolutely necessary. For some time the money would go to the Bank, but after that it might be devoted quietly and persistently to accumulating materials of war and laying by a reserve for a new campaign. This certainly would have been a very deep design, but those who believe that M. THIERS ever entertained it must have a low opinion of his powers. It seems a puerile method of getting ready for war to pay away sixty millions unnecessarily, merely that a nation may get so used to taxation that it will not mind giving or paying when the money is applied to military purposes. Even if M. THIERS ever had this remote object, and M. MAGNE was a partner in his designs, it would have been much wiser to get the nation into the habit of paying six millions a year without grumbling or noticing it than to have got into the habit of paying eight millions with groans and lamentations. There must have been some reason for M. MAGNE's insisting in spite of his political interests that the bargain with the Bank should be strictly carried out. This reason, it can scarcely be doubted, was that M. MAGNE foresaw that the question would be asked, if six millions will do instead of eight, why will not four millions do instead of six, or two instead of four, or in short why repay the Bank at all?

The explanation of the pertinacity with which M. THIERS and M. MAGNE have stuck to the repayment of the Bank is to be found perhaps not in the general doctrines of political economy so much as in the peculiar history of French finance. Frenchmen know the consequences of an unlimited issue of inconvertible paper, they know the enormous pains that have been taken to make the Bank of France a safe and solid institution, and they see how easily any party in power can make the Bank accommodate itself to designs that may be full of danger for the future. It is, therefore, not unintelligible that some of the more cautious of French financiers should strive to make the process of borrowing from the Bank in a critical moment against a largely increased inconvertible issue one that should be viewed by the nation in a very serious light. To get the money out of the current proceeds of taxation is to stamp the seriousness of the transaction on the national mind in the most impressive manner. It is something like the process of raising very heavy taxes in time of war instead of borrowing all that is wanted. The object of this is, among other things, that those who make the war should suffer by it, and feel it, and thus have the question whether they are wise constantly brought home to them. In the same way French financiers may say that in France the one lesson most needed is that those who use the power of the State over the Bank shall be bound to see that loans got by the expansion of an inconvertible currency are repaid, not by mere loans, but by taxes, so that every one may know and feel what has been done. The two great

dangers of France are that a faction may get the upper-hand, and the command of the central machinery for a time, or that some established Government may, in a moment of impulse or folly, embark on such adventures as the Mexican expedition and the German war. It is a considerable restraint on the evils which such national calamities produce if the expansion of an inconvertible currency is looked on generally as a resource to which resort cannot be had without calling the country to submit to immediate and heavy burdens. M. MAGNE has perhaps seen enough of financing under different Governments to make him alive to the value of such a restraint. In itself, therefore, the conclusion to which the Assembly may have come may not be an unwise one. If M. THIERS had originally proposed to pay off the Bank advances in ten years instead of seven and a half, no great objection would probably have been made, and M. MAGNE would have found himself pledged to provide only six millions in the present financial year. To reduce the repayments now to six millions annually may be better than to invent taxes which are unproductive or palpably unfair. The Assembly has taken the easiest course, and it is difficult to say that it is not the wisest that could have been taken under the circumstances. And yet there may be something to be said for the views of an old financier who says that this is the first step in the fatal process of making things pleasant, and that rather than consent to this he will let some one else be responsible for the management of financial affairs.

THE IRISH COERCION ACTS.

THE Irish Home Rule members may be congratulated on the discovery of a legitimate grievance. It is true that they and their country are not more seriously injured by a Continuance Bill than by a separate and formal re-enactment of the measures which are necessary to preserve life and property in Ireland; but there is an obvious inconsistency between the customary professions of Ministers of all parties and the practice which has been recently adopted. It has long been deemed proper to express the profoundest regret for necessary suspensions of constitutional rights; and perhaps some Ministers may in good faith have confused their sorrow for the state of society which requires Coercion Bills with an imaginary repugnance to the application of the indispensable remedy. The late Government had nevertheless introduced the practice of including Coercion Bills in the list of measures which are annually continued by an Act passed at the end of the Session. Lord SALISBURY and Lord CARNARVON have formerly objected to the whole system of Continuance Bills as opposed to all true principles of legislation. The exemption of stock-in-trade from rating has been annually re-enacted during several generations; and probably there are other perennial measures which in the same manner assume on the Statute-book an annual character. It may be reasonably contended that measures of a permanent nature ought not to be limited in duration, and, on the other hand, that Bills destined to last only for a year should be allowed to expire at the end of the term. It may be assumed that Continuance Bills are convenient, or that they save trouble; but they are certainly not applicable to matters of principle, and perhaps the prohibition of the use of firearms by Fenians cannot be considered wholly a matter of course. In answer to Mr. BUTT's appeal, Mr. DISRAELI acknowledged to some extent the justice of his remonstrance, and it was arranged that the Irish members should be allowed a day for the utterance of their patriotic indignation. It seems that there was no urgent necessity for the continuance of the Acts, as the more important measures will only expire at the end of the Session of 1875. It occurred to the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER that the Session might perhaps be prematurely interrupted with the result of abolishing all the securities against violence which are provided by the Coercion Acts. Mr. BUTT then offered to assent to the substitution of a fixed date for the indefinite period depending on the Session, but, as his offer was not accepted, he afterwards withdrew it. On the other hand, the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER withdrew on similar grounds a proposal to allow the Irish members a day for themselves, on condition that they would for the time allow business to proceed. It was not to be expected that they would throw away an opportunity of urging complaints which the PRIME MINISTER himself had recognized as just.

The affront offered to Ireland is of a shadowy nature. The other provisions of the Continuance Bill were unopposed, except indeed that Captain NOLAN thought fit to object to the Masters and Servants Bill, on the ground that a new measure ought to have been introduced in the present Session. Saturday morning was, as some of the speakers admitted, devoted exclusively to Irish affairs, though perhaps the choice of an unusual day may be thought to have involved a slight. Objections were as easily made to the principle of coercion as if the Bills had not been contumeliously amalgamated with a mass of uninteresting English measures. It appears that, as might be expected, peaceable persons living under a strict and exceptional law are occasionally subjected to inconveniences for which they receive no equivalent except in the greater security of their persons and property. One member related a touching story of himself and his son, beginning with the bursting of a gun-barrel which could not be sent to Cork for repair until it was taken there by a friendly magistrate. The Inspector of Constabulary could only take charge of the damaged implement when he had occasion to send an escort to Cork. Perhaps he was afraid that otherwise Fenian conspirators might obtain possession of the formidable weapon. The speeches against the Coercion Acts were perhaps not absolutely decisive. Some members referred to the diminution of crimes of violence, and to the satisfactory reports of the Judges of Assize, in proof of the tranquillity of Ireland. The condition of the country has greatly improved during the last two or three years while the exceptional Acts have been in force. It is entirely uncertain whether order would have equally prevailed if there had been no check on the seditious extravagance of the newspapers, and if the population had been allowed to provide themselves with firearms. Some time has probably elapsed since a suspected prisoner has been committed who might, under the ordinary law, have claimed his release by writ of Habeas Corpus. The knowledge that the authorities are armed with sufficient power inspired a wholesome caution. The continuance of the Peace Preservation Act and the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act are the only measures specially affecting Ireland which have been passed during the present Session. The Irish Judicature Bill would, even if it had been pressed, have excited little enthusiasm. Irish lawyers, though they acknowledge the propriety of establishing the same Supreme Court for the whole of the United Kingdom, have for the most part been opposed to the abolition of the judicial functions of the House of Lords. The proposed reduction in the number of Irish Judges was highly unpopular, although Mr. SULLIVAN professes to approve of the project. When the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER appealed to the forbearance of Mr. BUTT and his supporters on the ground that a reasonable portion of the Session had been devoted to Irish affairs, he referred to the debates on Home Rule, on the purchase of Irish railways, and on the Irish judicial system, and to other discussions which, however instructive, were utterly barren of result.

The considerable body of Home Rule members who were returned at the general election have on the whole done no discredit to their constituencies. It fortunately happens that neither party had any sufficient motive for bidding for their support, and consequently they have not, like their predecessors in former Parliaments, complicated political calculations by alliances formed for special purposes. On the majority of questions the Home Rule members support the Liberal party, if only because it happens for the present to be in opposition. In former times Mr. DISRAELI repeatedly made overtures for an understanding with the Roman Catholic members; and he might perhaps have ultimately succeeded if his combinations had not been defeated by the imprudence of the late Lord DERBY. Since the date of the Irish Church Bill Mr. DISRAELI has become a zealous Protestant, and his opposition to Rome has recently been stimulated by the unexpected interest shown by the House of Commons in the Public Worship Bill. On every ground Mr. DISRAELI would now be disinclined to court the Irish Roman Catholics; and he is independent of their Parliamentary support. Mr. GLADSTONE has since the first days of the Session absented himself from Irish discussions; but Lord HARTINGTON expressed in the strongest language, and with the apparent approval of his political associates, the firm determination of the party not to tamper with the integrity of the United Kingdom. Left to themselves, the supporters of Home Rule have offered no factious interruption to general business, nor can it be said that they

have occupied an unreasonable space of the time at the disposal of Parliament. Mr. BUTT had long been known as a fluent and effective speaker. Mr. SULLIVAN has in his first Session displayed considerable oratorical power. There is no reason to expect that during the continuance of the present Parliament the cause of Home Rule will be materially advanced; but its promoters have done their cause no injury. In the division on Mr. BUTT's motion for Home Rule they attained the estimated number of sixty votes; and they ascertained that, with one or two insignificant exceptions, they have nothing to hope from any alliance with English or Scotch Liberals of an extreme type. Only a few candidates in Great Britain condescended at the last election to bid for the votes of the Irish population in large towns by promising to join in the agitation for the dismemberment of the Empire. Not one among the scanty number ventured to speak in favour of Mr. BUTT's motion.

The most exciting debates of the Session have had little interest for Irish Roman Catholics. The Public Worship Bill affected them as little as the Bill for abolishing patronage in the Scotch Church; and the Endowed Schools Commission had exercised no jurisdiction in Ireland. The most gratifying result of the Session to the more far-seeing Home Rule members probably consists in the failures and disasters which have befallen the Government, though they have enjoyed a partial triumph in their opposition to the Continuance Bill, and also in the exhibition on Thursday night of a pertinacity especially congenial to their feelings. The Conservative majority is still unbroken; but there are symptoms of divisions in the party, if not among the Ministers themselves. The official promoters of the measures which have been withdrawn acquiesce only ostensibly and under compulsion in the disappointment of their hopes. Notwithstanding the great advantages with which he commenced the Session, and the disorganization of the Liberals during the prolonged absence of their leader, Mr. DISRAELI has not hitherto succeeded in making use of the power with which he was entrusted by the country. Advocates of Home Rule and of other mischievous innovations are beginning to recover courage in the anticipation of another political change which may restore their power of deciding the conflicts of evenly-balanced parties.

THE WORSHIP BILL IN COMMITTEE.

ONLY a courageous man could venture to sum up the final character of the ARCHBISHOPS' Bill until it has gone up again to the Lords and back to the Commons. But enough has taken place in the Lower House to show that it will very certainly disappoint both the hopes and the fears with which its friends and its foes received its first proclamation by the hand of the "clever fellow." It was unblushingly brought in as a measure to put down what is called Ritualism by prelates whose official responsibility ought to have been a guarantee for their restraining rather than inflaming popular prejudice against undefined classes of clergymen, some of whom, as the ARCHBISHOPS well knew, were only Ritualists in the language of excited Puritanism, while others were men whose wayward extravagances were qualified by conspicuous self-sacrifice in the discharge of their pastoral office. In the hands of the Commons it has become an engine to enable an irresponsible Episcopate to enforce a hard and obsolete, not to say impossible, compliance with the Act of Uniformity upon all the clergy of the land, in disregard of moderating considerations of local circumstance and charitable common sense. This is as far as it goes a gain. The Bill in its earlier form of partial persecution might have worried out of the Established Church a party which has, at all events, the merit of possessing no small proportion of the learning and the devotion with which the Establishment can as a whole be credited, while the Puritan and latitudinarian residua would have soon learnt that if ever a threefold cord is unluckily broken, the weakened strands are unable to resist the slightest tension. As it now stands, it torments impartially, and, considering that the cuticles which can least resist the stings of parishioners who are not only aggrieved but rubrical are those of the votaries of the Church Association, we imagine that the Bill will not have very long become a reality before some of its warmest friends will gladly welcome a *modus vivendi* such as Convocation has undertaken to provide during the coming year.

This condition of things has been reached from peculiarities attaching to the composition of the somewhat

heterogeneous Conservative majority which are only just struggling into prominence, but which will probably assert themselves before the term of the Parliament has run. Mr. GLADSTONE's capricious and unexpected dissolution naturally produced a general scramble after seats on the principle of "first come first served," so that while in all likelihood the relative proportions of the parties were not much affected by the *coup d'état*, the antecedents of individual members were more local than would have been the case had there been a longer time to select candidates. On the whole Puritanism made no very conspicuous figure on the hustings except in one district. Lancashire Toryism having long taken "No Irish need apply" as its motto, its political religion has become conspicuously Protestant after the model not of the Prayer-book, but of Exeter Hall. So long as the Conservatives were out, the Lancashire squadron shared in the modest labour of making up minorities; but now that the party to which it belongs is on the SPEAKER's right hand, these hard-headed men, in whom great natural shrewdness contends with narrow education and provincial prejudice, have affected towards Toryism the attitude which the Irish, the Scotch, and the philosophic cliques successively assumed in regard to Liberalism. Their vehemence in pushing this Bill to a second reading carried with them the rank and file of country gentlemen, who are certainly not Ritualists, but who as a body as little accept Puritanism. These, however, were, so far as they acted consciously, animated by an honest, though contracted, idea of rigorously maintaining positive law, and it was not long before, in opposition to their Northern taskmasters, they carried words enacting that defect of ornament and vesture should be as unlawful as its excess. The concession is threatened on the Report, but anyhow the fact of its having been carried in the Committee must tell, while its excision would brand the Bill with a fatal mark of insincerity. Mr. DISRAELI has characteristically been sitting dumb during the Committee and waiting to see which side appeared most immediately popular. The lungs at all events of Lancashire prevailed, and he now walks a man of God hardly inferior in sanctity even to Lord PALMERSTON. If we could suppose that this alliance was likely to be permanent, we should anticipate difficulties for the vexed Establishment; but we can hardly imagine that a party who are at all events high-spirited and generous, and to whom the dogmatism of Lancashire politics has long been intolerable, while they had only to vote against it, will submit to its dictation now that it has mounted the Orange cockade and claims to rule their actions.

The discordant impulses under which the majority pressed the Bill on Tuesday evening manifested themselves in a rampant display of incredible inconsistency. Somewhat early in the debate the Committee hampered the wholesome discretion of quashing vexatious proceedings, which the Bill as it stood reserved to the Bishop, by creating an appeal to the Archbishop which was at once insulting to the suffragans generally, whom it stamped as unworthy of ordinary confidence, and also provocative of all the petty irritations in which ill-conditioned parishioners are invited to indulge at absolutely no personal expense. The Committee which had thus branded the Bishops of England as men unfit to walk alone was at the close of its proceedings called upon to consider the only one thing wanted to complete the absolute impartiality of the remedy which the Bill professed to apply to the disorders of the Church. All churches without exception—parish churches, cathedrals, abbeys, and college chapels—have been dragged into its clutches; all priests and deacons, from the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster to the curate of six weeks' standing, are amenable to its monitions and deprivations. Only the Bishops—men who have never been taxed with any superfluous regard for rubrics, and whom the Committee had just pronounced unworthy to be left in enjoyment of discretion over the prosecution of frivolous suits—had no place in the otherwise all-inclusive system. Accordingly, a clause was moved to enforce rubrical conformity upon the Bench by provisions founded *mutatis mutandis* on the remaining Bill. All at once the men who had previously been snubbing the united body of suffragans burst out—the proposal could not be serious, it was degrading the rulers of the Church, Bishops could not do wrong, the Bill would be lost, and so on—and the suggestion was rejected by a majority not much less than the one which crippled episcopal discretion. Mr. DISRAELI voted with the majority, Mr. HARDY, Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE,

and Lord JOHN MANNERS with the minority, while the Lancashire phalanx was on both occasions upon the winning side.

This display of unfairness was almost sublime in its effrontery, but the ruling clique had already exhibited a petty and ignorant jealousy which was in its way equally instructive. The Bill, as it went into Committee, concluded with a clause of exemptions, in which, with other places of worship which could not plead the same positive claims, the College chapels and University churches of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham were recited. Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT—forgetful that while a member at Oxford he is a Professor at Cambridge—burst into one of those declamatory appeals to Puritan suspicion in which he has lately been shining, and Lord SANDON capped the stilted acrimony of the front Opposition Bench. The claim for the exemption of the Universities was nothing less than statutory. The University Tests Act of 1871, while providing for the maintenance of Church of England worship in the chapels, lays down that, in spite of the Act of Uniformity (which it recites), the visitor may sanction the adoption by the College authorities on week days of a service "selected "or adapted" from that of the Prayer-book, while the Shortened Services—or more properly Act of Uniformity Amendment—Act of the following year particularly refers to, in order to confirm, this provision. Dr. BALL attempted to show that the College chapels got nothing more from the University Tests Act than that which the Act of the year after conferred on all parish churches; but his argument rested on a misapprehension. The Shortened Services Act lays down specific omissions which, and which alone, a clergyman may make in the prescribed order of morning and evening prayer, while he is bound to observe the regulated sequence of parts. The Universities Act permits the authorities of each College to rearrange the *disiecta membra* of the services according to their own discretion. As to the University churches, every one knows that a main feature of the Oxford or Cambridge Sunday is the University sermon, with the short and specific service with which it is accompanied. But there were even deeper objections to the rejection of the clause. At present there is no machinery to work the Bill in any College chapel; while it would be difficult to construct any which should be consistent with its principles of encouraging congregational objections, and which should not either set up students as delators of the authorities under whom they were placed, or proceed on the assumption that their souls were worth less than those of graduates. Besides, the chapels are, as Mr. HENLEY pointed out, of a private character, and the Universities themselves had unequivocally expressed the value they set on the exemption. All these reasons were pressed, but the Lancashire members would see nothing in the clause except a deliberate attempt to practise unlawful rites on the part of institutions about which it was pretty clear that they knew little and cared less, and, as on other divisions, they led the large proportion of the House into their lobby. The natural sequel of this heedless legislation is that Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY has to encumber the Bill on the Report with a perfectly useless and unworkable, but not less vexatious, clause, which is intended to bring the chapels of the Colleges and of the Inns of Court within its scope by substituting visitors for bishops, and graduates or barristers for parishioners.

THE DEBATE ON DISSOLUTION.

THE result of Wednesday's debate in the French Assembly was so well ascertained beforehand that no considerable speaker seems to have troubled himself to take part in it. It is probable that the present Assembly will stay where it is until its departure is gently accelerated by external pressure. Public and private motives alike prompt a majority of the deputies to this course. The Assembly has had very good reason to be ashamed of itself, and representative bodies in this position are naturally slow to face their constituents. No matter which theory is adopted as to the charge committed to the Assembly in 1871, the deputies will equally be found wanting. If we say, with the Republicans, that it was elected to make peace with the Germans and to provide for the burdens which the acceptance of peace involved, it has clearly stayed beyond its time, and wandered off into discussions with which it had, properly speaking, no business to meddle. If we say, with

the Monarchists, that it was elected to decide between Monarchy and the Republic, and to rejoice the heart of every true Frenchman by restoring him to the loving arms of a legitimate King, it has equally failed in its duty. The one thing that it has done is a thing that could by no possibility have been foreseen at the time of the election. It has created the Septennate. Even then it has liked its own creation so little that it has refused to go on with the work. These are not the antecedents which make the prospect of dissolution pleasant. To have done that which you were never bidden to do, and to have left undone that which you were bidden to do, is good material for a general confession, but election addresses ought to take a less penitential strain. It does not require much modesty to teach a deputy who feels that absolutism is all that he can ask, and more than he deserves, that his re-election is very improbable; and country life in France is not so amusing that men who have left it behind for the first and last time should be anxious to make their stay at Versailles any shorter than it need be. The daily debates yield some excitement, and the mere thought that he is somebody, even though it be only one among 750 somebodies, is a pleasant change to a man who before 1871 had never dreamed that such a distinction was reserved for him. Public grounds for dreading a dissolution are not so completely wanting but that a deputy who dislikes being candid with himself may easily find another explanation for voting against the proposal. After all, nobody can certainly predict what sort of people the new deputies may be, and to entrust the future of France to men about whom all that we know is that nothing can be known would be an act of great rashness. Of course the deputies who rely on this argument forget that to leave the future of France in the hands of men who have proved that they are quite unfit to have such a trust committed to them is an act of equal or greater rashness. But it is not easy to convince timid people that inaction may be as dangerous as action, or that when the tide is rising a boat may be safer than a rock. The present Assembly does not mean to do any mischief, and this is more than can be said of any future Assembly. There is great persuasive force about a statement of this kind, and in various forms it makes the staple of most of the reasoning against an appeal to the country.

A more interesting question than the probability of the Assembly dissolving of its own free will is the probability of its being compelled to dissolve by a hint from Marshal MACMAHON. In his speech on Wednesday the new MINISTER of the INTERIOR resorted to the expedient, so well known to mothers, of taking for granted that the deputies were going to be good children and do just what they were told. They have been a little fractious lately, it is true, and have made wry faces at the Septennate whenever that necessary, but untempting, dose has been offered them. But this is quite accounted for by the heat of the weather—always a disturbing element in large nurseries—and General CHABAUD LATOUR feels sure, or says that he feels sure, that when the summer is over the Assembly will return with a firm determination to spend the winter afternoons profitably. On reassembling, my dears, we shall discuss the constitutional laws, and there will, I am convinced, be a sufficient number of good children among you to pass them in a shape adapted to the interests of the country. Your father and I advise you to take your usual rest, and by way of holiday task to ascertain the wishes of your constituents. On your return you will be disposed—this is a point on which no doubt can be permitted for a moment—to pass laws designed to “give the MARSHAL additional strength, and to produce that calm indispensable both to those who work and those who wait.” What these last words—which suggest that General CHABAUD LATOUR has lately been studying MILTON’S sonnets—precisely mean is not obvious, but the general drift of the Minister’s speech is plain enough. The Assembly has pledged itself to give Marshal MACMAHON certain additional powers. The MARSHAL expected that this pledge would have been fulfilled before the prorogation; but he is willing to give the Assembly another chance of life by extending the time allowed it to make good its promise. If the Septennate is organized next winter the MARSHAL will be satisfied, and with this intimation he dismisses the deputies to their homes. When they come back to Versailles they will know what the work to be done is, and that the only alternative open to them is to do it themselves or to make way for those who will do it. If

they choose the first, and pass the constitutional laws in a shape agreeable to the MARSHAL, all will go well. There will be no dissolution, and France may rest content under an Assembly which, if it does not represent its constituents, at least knows what is good for them better than they do themselves. If the constitutional laws are again postponed or defeated, the Government will have no difficulty in getting rid of the Assembly. The minority in favour of a dissolution is large enough to be converted into a majority by the mere addition of the Cabinet and their immediate supporters, and even if it were not so, no party would like to incur the discredit of seeming afraid to meet the electors when once Marshal MACMAHON has declared that the time has come for them to do so.

The question whether there will be a dissolution after the recess resolves itself therefore into the question whether it is possible to construct a majority in the present Assembly in favour of organizing the Septennate. There are only two ways in which this object can be attained. One is to organize the Septennate pure and simple—to return, that is, to the old Right Centre idea; the other is to organize it in conjunction with the Republic—to adopt, that is to say, the Left Centre idea. It would probably be possible to secure a working majority in favour of the latter scheme provided that the Government would support it. But then there is nothing to show that the Government is prepared to support it. Marshal MACMAHON apparently holds that he is equally bound to prevent the Republicans from stealing a march on the Monarchists, and the Monarchists from stealing a march on the Republicans. So long as he adheres to this view he cannot vote for, or even remain neutral on, the CASIMIR-PÉRIER or any similar proposal, and the Republicans are not strong enough in the Assembly to carry their point without the aid, still less against the opposition, of the Government. What the MARSHAL himself would probably like would be to reunite the old Conservative majority, and vote a Constitution identical with that which the Duke of BROGLIE was unable to carry. The *Times*’ Correspondent makes a statement which is ominous of failure as regards this scheme. The Legitimists, he says, are determined to make one more effort to restore the Count of CHAMBORD, and they will make it during the coming recess. Now the old Conservative majority cannot be reconstructed without the Legitimists, and the principal occupation of the Duke of BROGLIE for some time to come will be to convince them that it is their best policy to act once more with the Right Centre. What chance will such a tame suggestion as this have with men who are already engaged in the exciting business of scheming for the last time to effect a Restoration? While this latter plan is in the air the Duke of BROGLIE will talk to deaf ears and preoccupied hearts. When this project has again been defeated the counsels of the Right Centre will be more distasteful than ever to the Legitimists. They will be accusing the Orleanists of treachery to the Monarchical cause, of self-satisfied interference with the plans of their lawful sovereign, of a disloyal determination to subject HENRY V. to restrictions which would have been rejected by the greatest of his ancestors, and were only assented to by the most unfortunate of them. Men who bring these charges in earnest are not easily won over to co-operation with the men against whom they bring them. The Legitimists will not have even a second vote to give to the Septennate; they will probably hold that even the most extreme Republican is a more respectable, because a more open, foe than an Orleanist. Consequently when the Assembly meets again their hostility to the Government is likely to be even more pronounced than it has been this Session. The misdeeds of the Orleanists will be fresher in their recollection, and their determination to tempt any dangers rather than accept safety at the hands of the Right Centre will be proportionately resolute. So far, therefore, as it is possible to forecast what will happen three months hence in France, it seems likely that Marshal MACMAHON, finding himself hemmed in by the Republic on one hand and a Restoration on the other, will try what a dissolution will do to help him out of his dilemma. He has more faith in the Septennate than most of his countrymen, and he may perhaps be genuinely convinced that a general election would return him a more manageable Assembly.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

THE proposed Reciprocity Treaty between Canada and the United States will probably be eventually concluded, although the Senate has, perhaps for the purpose of proclaiming its indifference, adjourned without taking the project into consideration. In a certain sense it is an anomaly that a dependency should negotiate an important treaty with a foreign Power; nor can any Reciprocity Treaty fail, at least in the first instance, to be injurious to English commerce. It may nevertheless probably be expedient to acquiesce in the proposed arrangement, and even to take part in the negotiations, as far as may be necessary for the removal of diplomatic difficulties. Canada is loyal to England, on the well-understood condition that the colony is never to make a sacrifice for the benefit of the mother-country. If the Canadians think that free commercial intercourse with the United States is indispensable to their prosperity, it would be difficult to prevent their acceptance of conditions which may be injurious to England and even to themselves. It is uncertain whether the whole North American Continent may not at some future time be united in a single Confederation; but few Englishmen desire to accelerate the union. Any attempt to obstruct the establishment of Free-trade between Canada and the United States would furnish a powerful and plausible argument for the annexation which the majority of American politicians hold to be inevitable. By a curious inconsistency Protectionists in the United States, as in Russia, are at all times willing to remove further and further off the barrier which is to exclude foreign competition. The same Congress which maintains distinctive duties on imported commodities would gladly institute Free-trade with neighbouring countries on condition that they should be included within the dominions of the Union. The popular opinion on proposals for reciprocity will be mainly influenced by the light in which a close commercial connexion with Canada may be regarded. After the close of the war, the former Reciprocity Treaty was denounced by the Federal Government in resentment of the impartiality or Confederate sympathy which was attributed to the colonists. The American manufacturers probably stimulated the feeling which found vent in the rupture of commercial intercourse, but the measure was due rather to national passion than to selfish calculation. A renewal of the treaty may perhaps now be made popular as a commencement of the process which is to detach Canada from the English Empire. The effect of commercial relations in facilitating political union has received a striking illustration in Germany. The States which formed the Zollverein had become accustomed to the supremacy of Prussia long before the establishment either of the Northern Confederacy or of the more recent Empire. It is not proposed by the promoters of the Reciprocity Treaty that Canada and the United States should agree on a common tariff, but one of the objects of the American negotiators is to discourage the importation of English goods into Canada as well as into the States. Hereafter it is not improbable that the inland Custom Houses will be altogether abolished.

The authors of the Washington Treaty gave the first impulse to the present movement by opening the Canadian fisheries to the citizens of the United States in return for a similar privilege allowed to Canadians in American waters. As it happened that the Canadian fisheries were valuable and the New England fisheries almost worthless, it was provided that a money payment to the Canadian Government should form part of the consideration. Rights of passage were at the same time granted over the ship canals on either side of the St. Lawrence; and the details of the arrangements both as to the fisheries and the canals were referred to future negotiation. By the projected treaty the money payment is to be remitted in consideration of the commercial advantages of reciprocity; and both Canada and the United States agree to improve their respective canals so as to connect for joint use the upper waters of the great lakes with the sea. The object of the agreement seems to be laudable; and it must be presumed that the Canadian negotiators will take care that their rights and liabilities are fairly balanced. It is for the general interest that all land and water highways should be freely open for the use of all nations. If two neighbouring communities, accustomed to daily unrestricted intercourse, become in the end unconscious of the imaginary line by which they are separated, it is not in the power,

nor is it for the interest, of England to prevent a virtual union which may perhaps afterwards assume a more formal shape. Yet it is a cause for reasonable regret that ignorance and prejudice should render it necessary for Canada and the United States to provide artificially for an intercourse which, but for vicious laws, would be independent of diplomacy. The Reciprocity Treaty is not an unqualified advance in sound commercial policy. As far as Canada is concerned, Free-trade with the United States implies distinctive duties on English trade, to be either directly or indirectly imposed. Since the abolition of the former Reciprocity Treaty Canada has been induced to cultivate foreign commerce; and the experiment has been so successful that the Dominion is, after England and the United States, the first of existing communities in the magnitude of its commercial marine. The duties on imports, although they are improperly high, have been for the most part imposed for the legitimate purpose of revenue, although, like all new countries, Canada hankers after the imaginary independence which is supposed to be secured by the establishment of native manufactures. According to the terms of the proposed treaty all Canadian produce is after a certain interval of time to be admitted into the United States free of duty; and consequently the temptation to cultivate and to protect domestic manufactures will be increased in the proportion which the American market bears to that of the Dominion. If the plan is adopted, English products will still be liable to heavy duties on the American frontier, while similar articles made in Canada will be entitled to free admission. It will become the interest of Canadian dealers to prefer domestic manufactures; and eventually perhaps the American tariff may be applied to sea-borne goods entering Canadian ports. The liberality of the American Government may be explained by the backward state of manufacturing industry in Canada. If the United States manufacturers should find themselves able both to undersell their neighbours and to exclude the productions of European competitors, they will justly applaud the acuteness of their diplomatic representatives.

As English interests are not likely to be regarded by the negotiators on either side, it may be prudent to accept without reluctance an arrangement which will in some respects be beneficial both to Canada and to the United States. The monopoly of the fisheries concerns the Canadians alone; and while it was not likely to be given away without an equivalent, it was a dangerous though valuable possession. American fishermen were incessantly poaching in Canadian waters, and successive Secretaries of the State Department were ingenious in discovering legal excuses for the trespasses which were committed by their fellow-citizens. It was never easy to come to an agreement as to the measurement of the limit of three miles which bounds the appropriated marine territory. One party demanded that the boundary should follow every indentation of the coast; while the Canadians wished that the line should be drawn from headland to headland. If a Canadian cruiser seized an intrusive fishing-boat the commander of the nearest American ship of war was generally ready to remonstrate, and occasionally to threaten recourse to force. It was not a gratifying reflection that, among the many concessions by which the Treaty of Washington was purchased, the English plenipotentiaries had surrendered the Canadian fisheries. If the American fishermen are admitted to share in the fisheries by the provisions of a local Reciprocity Treaty, no reasonable objection can be made to the free disposition of property by its undoubted owners. When at some distant time political majorities in the United States learn the rudiments of political economy, Reciprocity Treaties will become obsolete. In the meantime, while Canada will suffer by any augmentation of the tariff on sea-borne goods, the advantage of the treaties to the United States will be almost unmixed. The mischief of a Protectionist policy varies inversely with the area in which it is practised. The North American States constitute a little world of their own which will be doubled in extent by the inclusion of the Canadian Dominion. The French provinces before the Revolution, and the little German States before the establishment of the Customs Union, were debarred from commercial intercourse with their immediate neighbours. The Pennsylvanian ironmasters are compelled to content themselves with the exclusion of England and Belgium from equal competition. If Canadian minerals should be worked on a large scale, American producers must be prepared for an equal contest. They are probably justified in the belief

that the opening of the Canadian market to their goods will more than compensate them for any competition which is likely to arise. Fifty years ago English statesmen would have held that a preference accorded by a colony to foreign produce was an intolerable and rebellious act. Necessity has since that time taught their successors many useful lessons, including the conviction that acquiescence is prudent when compulsion is at the same time impossible and undesirable. The Reciprocity Treaty will be sanctioned by the Imperial Government of the day with the most courteous readiness.

THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

THERE is some ground for suspecting that, however other public interests may have been affected by the change of Government, the National Gallery has been a decided gainer. Mr. DISRAELI is quite right in disliking the particular arrangement by which the PEEL Collection was bought. If it was thought expedient to spend 75,000*l.* on strengthening the Dutch element in the National Collection, the money ought to have been voted by Parliament, and the Director of the National Gallery left free to expend the usual 10,000*l.* in each subsequent year. Instead of this, the annual grant for the purchase of pictures was mortgaged, and the Director was thus shut out from buying any picture for the next seven years without the special intervention of the House of Commons. This is a most unfortunate disability for the manager of a great national collection to be subjected to. It is impossible to say beforehand what pictures may come into the market, and opportunities of buying to advantage may often occur without his venturing to make or, perhaps without his thinking them important enough to justify, a special application to the Government. Whenever it is thought necessary to exceed the annual sum within which the Director is allowed to purchase on his own responsibility, the whole excess ought to be paid at once. As regards the pictures bought from the BARKER Collection, Mr. BURTON was fortunately able to convince the Government that the occasion called for some liberality, and the full annual grant has been expended as though it had not been anticipated in favour of the PEEL Collection. The only cause for regret in the matter is, that Mr. BURTON should have been restricted to 10,000*l.* It is probable that this sum might have been considerably exceeded with advantage to the National Gallery.

This is not the place to follow Mr. DISRAELI into the vexed question whether the new PIETRO DELLA FRANCESCA is "one of the most exquisite specimens of one of the 'rarest artists that exists,' or the battered and transformed wreck that Mr. J. C. ROBINSON maintains it to be. The controversy is interesting to artists, and still more perhaps to oil and colourmen, for in Mr. ROBINSON's hands it has shown some tendency to deviate from the merits of the particular picture into the merits of various kinds of varnish. But it is not one that can be carried on with advantage either in Parliament or in the columns of a newspaper. Neither the public nor the Government are fit judges whether a picture is substantially what it was when it left the master's hands, or whether it has been improved out of all knowledge by subsequent restorers. That is a point upon which the Director of the National Gallery must form his own judgment. All that the Government can do is to choose the Director wisely. There has been a growing disposition of late years to make the House of Commons the ultimate Court of Appeal in matters upon which no opinions but those of experts are really worth considering. Even Mr. ROBINSON would hardly feel his conviction that this picture is a ruin materially strengthened by a Parliamentary resolution to that effect. It is very well that critics who disapprove of the purchases made by the Director of the National Gallery should express their dissent, because in a matter of so much difficulty no man can be exempt from mistakes, and the knowledge that such and such a purchase has been challenged on such and such grounds may make the Director more careful in the future exercise of his trust. But the object of this criticism is the enlightenment of the Director, not of the public. Nothing would be more injurious to the formation of a really great collection than the intrusion of the popular taste into the purchase of pictures. Yet if everybody were encouraged to give his opinion on the

merits of each fresh addition to the Gallery, it would soon be difficult to keep the public from dictating what class of pictures should be bought. The National Gallery might be made a more popular exhibition, but its value to those who have a real concern for art would be seriously impaired. Mr. DISRAELI protested, with much justice, against the practice of raising objections to particular purchases on the score of price. There is no precise means of determining whether a picture is worth the money which it fetches in an auction-room. Sums which a few years ago would have been thought excessive would now be thought to be extremely moderate. The number of buyers has become so much larger, and so much more money is devoted to the formation and extension of private collections, that the Director of the National Gallery has to prepare for a different kind of competition from that which he had formerly to encounter. Besides this, the value of a picture to a public Gallery may bear no proportion to its value to the rest of the world. If the National Collection had already been rich in examples of PIETRO DELLA FRANCESCA it might not have been worth while to give 2,400*l.* for Mr. BARKER's specimen. In every Gallery there must be many unrepresented or imperfectly represented masters; and a picture which fills up a gap in the succession of schools or painters has an importance beyond its intrinsic merit. In this respect the Director has to consult the interest of students of art, and to decide whether the nearer approach to completeness is worth the outlay necessary to attain it.

It is satisfactory to hear from the PRIME MINISTER that the country ought to purchase all the best works of art as far as possible, whether they be pictures, statues, or gems. Unfortunately the occasions for holding him to his words are not likely to be very numerous. Great works of art are but seldom offered for sale, and when they are there is almost always considerable competition between the public Galleries of different countries. It is plain that when this is the case a mere order to spend without stint may simply result in running up a picture to a fancy price without ensuring its acquisition. As between rival public Galleries the best course would be to come to some sort of understanding by which each Director should be allowed to carry off pictures of the schools in which his Gallery was most defective. It is of more importance that a national collection should be representative than that it should be rich in great works, unless indeed any particular master happens to be strongly represented, in which case it may be expedient that the means of studying him in detail should as far as possible be brought together in one place. Ordinarily speaking, however, a National Gallery is intended for students and visitors living in the country by which it is kept up, and for their purposes the nearer a Gallery comes to the presentation of a fairly complete history of painting, the better it answers its end. Where private buyers are concerned, the chance of the Director of the National Gallery finding himself constantly outbidden is much less. Even 10,000*l.* a year is a larger sum than most people care to spend on pictures; and those who are able and anxious to spend this might sometimes, or even often, be willing not to bid against the nation. If the Government dealt more liberally by the public in the matter of art, the public might deal more liberally by the Government. There would probably be more bequests and more gifts. Nor is there much fear that Parliament would interfere to prevent the national revenue from being laid out in this way. The disposition to look at every item of expenditure as so much money extracted from the taxpayers has disappeared with a fairer adjustment of taxation; and the danger now perhaps is that the classes who pay very little will press their representatives to vote for many expenses on the plea that they will exclusively fall upon the classes who pay a good deal. There are few ways of employing public money which give so much pleasure to so many persons as the purchase of great pictures. We do not pretend that the crowds who will walk through the National Gallery next Monday will admire the pictures which best deserve admiration. A collection of very inferior merit might perhaps be more popular. But good pictures give a certain amount of pleasure even to those who know nothing about them, while to those who do know something they give a very great deal of pleasure. Consequently, the sum of enjoyment produced by them is very large—larger, we are inclined to think, than is produced by any other of the modes in which Governments are accus-

tomed to spend the money entrusted to them. It is to be hoped that many good pictures will be offered for sale while Mr. DISRAELI is in a position to give effect to his theory of the duty of purchasing them for the nation.

THE SESSION.

THE new Parliament met on the 5th of March, but only to re-instate Mr. Brand in the office of Speaker, and it was not until the 19th that business was formally begun with the Queen's Speech, which held out the promise of several measures of an unambitious but useful kind. The programme of the new Ministry included Bills for facilitating the Transfer of Land, for completing the Judicature Act of last year, for the amendment of Lord Aberdare's Licensing Act, for the reform of Friendly Societies, and for the regulation of the relations between Employers and Labourers after a Commission which was to be appointed had made its report. It seemed a modest programme for a strong Ministry with an indisputable majority in both Houses of Parliament, and probably no person would have been more surprised than the members of the Cabinet if a prophet had then told them that by the end of July they would have dropped their Land and Judicature Bills, that their Friendly Societies Bill would fall dead as soon as it was introduced, that their promised Bill affecting Employers and Labourers would not be introduced at all, and that, before they had done with the discussion of the Licensing Bill, they would have come to glorify Lord Aberdare's measure, and to own that the alterations they could suggest in it were of the most trivial kind. But if they could not have dreamt of these legislative failures, they can certainly claim the merit of having from the outset of the Session persistently followed a line of policy which has stamped its peculiar character on the Administration. They had made up their minds, or at any rate the leaders among them had decided, that they would not see in the strange result of the elections and in the downfall of Mr. Gladstone an occasion of mere party triumph. They would show nothing of that triumphant bitterness which has been the snare of so many successful politicians. To be courteous, and even affectionate, to the late occupants of the Treasury Bench, to adopt their plans, to imitate their spirit, and to diverge only by avoiding their mistakes, was the watchword of the Ministry. When on the debate on the Address the Duke of Somerset packed into a virulent speech as much abuse of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues as the ingenuity of ill-temper could squeeze in, not a single Conservative peer rose to support him. When in the Commons on the same occasion Sir William Stirling-Maxwell made the remarks on Mr. Gladstone's dissolution and its aims which had been for weeks in the mouth of every member of the victorious party, Mr. Disraeli coldly remarked that the attack had been made without consultation, and paid a handsome tribute to Mr. Gladstone's merits. A few weeks later a wild Conservative member made a direct attack on Mr. Gladstone, but so decisive were the orders of the chief, and so strict was the discipline of the party, that not a single Conservative rose to support the motion, and Mr. Smollett had to undergo the humiliation of finding his only supporter in Mr. Whalley. This gave Mr. Gladstone an opportunity of tasting the only political pleasure left to him, that of indulging in grand bursts of eloquence totally disproportionate to the occasion that draws them forth. He never said anything that in any way justified the strange policy he had adopted, although with unaffected cheerfulness he acquiesced in the result. But his adversaries, or rather his new friends, protectors, and admirers, took care never to press him, and the courtesy shown to the late Prime Minister was extended to all who had fallen with him. If Ireland came under discussion, all the Irish officials joined in eulogizing Lord Spencer. When an attack was made on Lord Cardwell for not having kept faith with the army in regard to enlistment, it was the Duke of Richmond who was filled with the liveliest horror of such an attack being made. Mr. Hardy, the Secretary for War, so completely separated himself from Mr. Hardy, the University member, that he insisted that Oxford must be made a military centre as Lord Cardwell had wished; and if anything like bitterness has been imported into debate, it came from the vanquished, not the victors, and found its first expression in a furious onslaught made, apparently for the mere fun of making it, by Mr. Goschen on Mr. Cross.

It was not, however, only in the region of small things and of personal amenities that harmony reigned between the late and the new Ministries. Sir Stafford Northcote prepared a Budget in as complete accordance with Mr. Gladstone's views as he could devise, and Mr. Gladstone was very well pleased with his pupil, who accepted the great surplus which Mr. Gladstone had announced, cut away the sugar duties, made a new hole in the proceeds of the Income-tax, gave a bonus to local taxpayers, and abolished the duty on horses. Mr. Gladstone was not quite sure about the horses, but he only objected in that mild way which masters adopt who wish to show a favourite pupil that in some little things they are still below the standard of the highest excellence. It was in vain that Sir John Lubbock pleaded for a more rapid repayment of the National Debt, and Mr. Leing insisted on the advantages of not lowering the Income-tax. The Budget was a popular Budget and Mr. Gladstone approved of it, and discussion was useless. Mr. Ward Hunt did, indeed, for a moment interrupt the pleasant flow of compliments between the

Ministry and the Opposition by a sensation speech in which he vowed that he had been left nothing but a phantom navy, and that a phantom navy was a thing his great mind would never stand. But he was soon recalled to the paths in which his superiors had decided that the Cabinet should walk, and Sir Stafford Northcote took an early opportunity of explaining that his colleague had been most unfortunately misunderstood, and that what he really meant was that, if he might add a hundred thousand pounds to the expenditure of ten millions which he had adopted from his predecessors, he would be quite happy and the navy would be as real a one as anybody could wish. This was a great triumph for Mr. Goschen and Mr. Childers, who pounded Mr. Ward Hunt with intense satisfaction, and made it as clear as daylight that the new broom was not going to sweep any cleaner than the old one. Mr. Hardy again owned that he did not see how he could do better than try to do exactly what Lord Cardwell would have done, and so the Army Estimates passed without a murmur and almost without discussion. The Ashantee war was fortunately over before the new Ministry had to deal with it, and its final success naturally relieved them from inquiring into any mistakes that marked its origin and early stages; and Lord Carnarvon announced a scheme for the government of the Gold Coast which received the cordial approval of Lord Kimberley. To pay a competent man fairly well, to keep him alive, if possible, and to give him ample power, were suggestions that commended themselves to the reason of all parties alike; and although there was some feeble resistance in the Commons to the apparent recognition of slavery by an English Government, Mr. Lowther was allowed to get out of the difficulty by declaring that the Fantees, although completely under the rule of the Governor, were to be considered as only protected by England, not subject to it, and that therefore England could not be held responsible for their deplorable practices. He had previously explained that to redeem the slaves would be frightfully expensive, and the House was sufficiently penetrated with this argument not to inquire too curiously into the meaning of a Protectorate under such circumstances.

The Ministry lost no time in bringing forward its promised Bills. The Land Transfer Bills and the Judicature Bill were introduced in the Lords, and were the joint products of Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne, so that there was not even the semblance of any real opposition to them. The Land Transfer Bill did not affect to be a great or sweeping measure. It avoided all such difficult questions as those of boundaries, of rights of way, and of short leasehold interests. It did not touch land in settlement. All it did was to establish a system of registration which might be expected to be gradually operative, and to give some facilities for creating charges without much trouble or expense. Lord Penzance and some other peers whose opinions are not without weight tried hard to save the jurisdiction of the House of Lords when the Judicature Bill came on for discussion. But Lord Cairns was firm, and the new Supreme Court of Appeal was constituted the final Court for Ireland and Scotland, as well as for England, an intermediate Court being, however, established, under certain restrictions, for England as well as for the sister kingdoms. The Friendly Societies Bill was an elaborate scheme, but it was received with general disfavour, as it seemed calculated to make the poor believe that the Government was in some way answerable for these Societies, while it really afforded no protection of the kind. The appointment of the Commission on the Master and Servant Acts was one of the first tasks the Home Secretary had to discharge, and it was made with the most indisputable fairness. It was represented that the Commission was not needed, and that it would be a sad thing if the Session passed away without legislation on the subject. But the Government would not propose any legislation until a Commission had reported, and, as it has turned out, the Session has passed away almost without any one noticing whether the Report had been presented, and without the slightest impatience for a new Act being shown. The Licensing Bill was introduced in redemption of the pledges given to the publicans by Conservatives at the recent elections. But the temper of a new House is difficult to guess, and it turned out that the new House was by no means inclined to throw itself into the arms of the public-house-keepers. The Ministry saw the humour of Parliament, and speedily docked its measure into very modest proportions. Mr. Cross had insisted that the hours of opening should be extended and that the discretion of magistrates should be taken away. He had further very imprudently said that he was in possession of evidence to show that the mass of local authorities were adverse to Lord Aberdare's measure. He was asked to produce this evidence, and it turned out to be very strongly in favour of this denounced Bill. Mr. Cross said that hours were of no particular consequence, and the House might fix them as it pleased, and lastly he agreed that it should be left to the discretion of the magistrates to decide what places were sufficiently populous to justify having their public-houses kept open for them till eleven. This was most amiable, but it was also most bewildering, and although the Bill, by removing one or two main grievances of the publicans, by extending the hours for the metropolis to half-past twelve, and by defining once for all that familiar legal puzzle the *bonâ-fide* traveller, did improve Lord Aberdare's Act, the improvements were of a remarkably humble kind. The Ministry also adopted and passed Mr. Stansfeld's Rating Bill of last Session and Mr. Mundella's Factory Bill, and this is the sum of their legislative achievements outside that sphere of ecclesiastical controversy by

entering or being forced into which they have had to see so much of their well-meant labours in secular matters thrown away.

For a time, however, the Ministry seemed to be prosecuting its main measures with a fair amount of success, and if it was not aiming at great things, no one expected that it would aim at great things, and it was doing all that it was asked to do. But it was not in the prosecution of its main measures that the success or good fortune of the Ministry really showed itself. What gave it chiefly the credit of being at once strong and prudent was the ease and rapidity with which all schemes that did not meet with its approval were disposed of, while at the same time everything was done to make the issues as little as possible party ones, and not to embitter defeat to those whose proposals were rejected. Mr. Trevelyan brought forward his favourite motion for the extension of household suffrage to the counties, and it then appeared how very fictitious was the adhesion of the Gladstone Cabinet to what a few months before had been described as the true basis of a new departure for the Liberal party. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright were far away. Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen walked out of the House. Mr. Lowe actually voted against the motion. Mr. Disraeli, true to his policy of conciliation, was politeness itself to Mr. Trevelyan, and quietly postponed a subject which on general grounds he was willing to take up, because the agricultural labourers, being at the moment engaged in a struggle for existence, were not at liberty to attend to politics. The Permissive Bill was snuffed out by a decisive vote; and that old bugbear of people who wish controversies to be waged on an intelligible issue, the 25th Clause, was assailed in vain by Mr. Richard, and defended not so much by the Government as by Mr. Forster. Mr. Disraeli so arranged things that Mr. Forsyth and the ladies never got a day for the discussion of their interesting grievances. The appointment of a special Minister for Education was in like manner combated as much by Mr. Lowe as by Mr. Disraeli; and when the subject so interesting to the Premier's agricultural friends, of compensation for unexhausted improvements, came on, Mr. Disraeli had the satisfaction of hearing Mr. Barclay denounce, from the experience of Scotland, the mischievous system of leases for nineteen years which used to be paraded before English landowners as the model arrangement which in their selfish blindness they would not accept. A change in the Scotch Game Laws, and a proposal to terminate the power of imprisonment given to County Court Judges, were discarded with equal facility. Mr. Plimsoll nearly got a majority in spite of the opposition of the Board of Trade, and a tiny majority was actually recorded in favour of a vote for giving money to Irish fisheries; yet these petty incidents only served by contrast to show how strong the Ministry was when it was known to be really interested in any question, although it hardly ever had to use its majority on any question that excited anything like real party feeling, except when it had to justify by force rather than argument Lord Sandon's Minute by which the standard of education made compulsory on pauper children was reduced in order to humour the prejudices of local guardians, or, as Lord Sandon put it, to make the cause of education, to which personally he was deeply attached, work practically in a slow, modest, and comfortable manner, so as to please all concerned.

Minor causes also conspired to make the Session a pleasant one for the Ministry. The conclusion of the Ashantee war and the return of Sir Garnet Wolseley and his companions gave Mr. Disraeli an opportunity of distributing honours and rewards, of making a set speech in proposing a vote of thanks to the troops, and of celebrating feats of arms which recalled the wonderful adventures of Cortes and Pizarro. The marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh, the visit of the Czar, the creation of the Duke of Connaught, and the establishment in life of Prince Leopold, were all opportunities which were welcomed by a Ministry anxious to be conspicuous for its loyalty, and which served to mark how times were changed since every shilling asked for from Parliament for the Royal Family was fought over with democratic parsimony. The Indian Famine created alarm and terror, and was made the subject of some explanatory remarks from the Duke of Argyll. But the danger was faced and met, and the hearty support given to Lord Northbrook, and the liberality and energy displayed by Lord Salisbury, proved that in this branch of administration England had at least lost nothing by the change of Ministry. The Indian Budget has as usual been deferred to a period of the Session which makes its discussion a piece of idle routine. But Lord Salisbury has attempted one measure of Indian improvement in the creation of a new Member of Council, whose special duty it shall be to guard against useless expenditure in public works. Whether the mode of grappling with an acknowledged evil which Lord Salisbury has adopted is the right one may be fairly questioned, and his proposal has against it the great weight of opinion which attaches to the opinions of Lord Lawrence, Lord Halifax, and Lord Napier. But at any rate the proposal shows how keenly the new Indian Secretary feels the mischief which unchecked or ill-directed expenditure inflicts on India, and his determination to stop it if he can, even though he may have to act on his own exclusive responsibility. But nothing proved more conclusively the strength of the Ministry, and the advantage which the country has in many respects derived from having a Conservative Ministry in office, than the decisive discouragement it was able to give to the Home Rulers. They began at the very beginning of the Session to force themselves on public attention, and Mr. Butt moved an amendment to the Address to

the effect that things could not be said to be going on well while Ireland was so little attended to, so unhappy, and so enslaved, and he taunted Mr. Gladstone with having left to his successors the legacy of a surplus, not only of money, but of Coercion Bills, to which Mr. Gladstone replied that when these Coercion Bills were being discussed he did not find that Irish members much objected to them. Mr. Disraeli would yield nothing to the Irish members, but he was civil to them as to every one else, and Sir Michael Hicks Beach, who had begun his career as Irish Secretary by some unwise remarks as to the Irish Church and Land Bills, was speedily recalled to the recollection that he had entered into the service of a Ministry which wished to let bygones be bygones and to make itself generally pleasant. The Home Rulers were even permitted by Mr. Disraeli to carry through the Commons a tiny measure of municipal reform, although when it got to the Lords the Bill was at once extinguished by Lord Cairns. For the discussion of the main project of Mr. Butt and his friends an ample opportunity was afforded, and it may be presumed that all that could be said for Home Rule was said. So far as unlimited abuse of England went, the speakers had a task in discharging which they were perfectly at home, but they never got over the preliminary difficulty of showing that their project was not totally impracticable. It did not accord with Mr. Gladstone's peculiar views of the functions of the leader of the Opposition that he should be even present in the House when a question was being debated which touched the profoundest interests of the Empire. He was reserving himself for sublimer things, and was nursing his powers in silence and seclusion until he could burst forth in all his might to discuss how Presbyterian ministers are to be elected, and how English curates are to be put down. In his absence, however, Lord Hartington spoke with his useful frankness on behalf of English Liberals, and declared that nothing would ever induce him to tamper with Home Rule in order to snatch a party advantage; while Mr. Disraeli did his best to reconcile the Home Rulers to the adverse decision which the House was going to pass on their scheme by expressing a mild wonder why the Irish were always so fond of reminding all the world that they had been conquered. In the heat of the election contest Mr. Disraeli had made all the capital he could out of the Government of Ireland by Coercion Bills under a Liberal Ministry. But in office he accepted these Coercion Bills as a matter of course, so much so that he thought it enough to include them in a general Continuance Bill in order to give Ireland the benefit of their renewed application. On the remonstrance of several Irish members he allowed, however, that this was rather a light mode of treating a serious matter, and he has undertaken that, if a further prolongation of the time during which the Coercion Acts are to operate is necessary, he will for the future invite the assent of Parliament in a separate and distinct form to the proposals he may have to make.

In the middle of June Mr. Disraeli warned the House that it had still a busy and a long Session before it, and he enumerated a long list of measures which the Government wanted passed before it could think of a prorogation. There seemed then so very little to do, and the measures that had to be passed seemed so entirely of the secondary order, and so little likely to provoke much discussion, that this was received as one of those pompous jokes with which Mr. Disraeli occasionally relieves the dullness of daily routine. Among those measures which were thought of such unexpected importance was the Scotch Patronage Bill, which, as it exclusively affected one division of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, was creeping unnoticed by most Englishmen through the House of Lords. But Mr. Disraeli had no eye for another ecclesiastical measure which was also creeping through the Lords, and evidently had no notion that it was of much importance or interest to any one. At least it could not be one of the measures that would be likely to make the Session busy and long. About three weeks later Mr. Gladstone, however, appeared on the scene, and seemed wild with joy and excitement at the delightful prospect of having two ecclesiastical Bills to deal with. He rushed into the arena and proclaimed that the Scotch Patronage Bill filled him with dismay and unhappiness, because, although it gave one set of Presbyterians something they wanted, and which no one grudged them, it left another set of Presbyterians exactly as they were. This remote grievance, however, would not probably have troubled many members very much, and Mr. Gladstone would hardly have been repaid for the trouble of attending in his place in Parliament, had it not been that immediately afterwards Mr. Russell Gurney brought forward the Public Worship Regulation Bill, which had come down from the Lords after undergoing a series of the most astonishing vicissitudes. The Bill, or rather a Bill, on the same subject had been originally introduced by the two Archbishops, but it had met with a very cold reception, and had been exposed to a criticism which would have been quite fatal to it had not it suddenly found new authors of its being in Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne, who came like two good-natured cuckoos and laid their egg in the nest of the archiepiscopal hedge-sparrow, and sent a little cuckoo and not a little hedge-sparrow into the world. The transmuted Bill was represented as extremely harmless and incapable of doing any harm to any one, and it got through the Lords with ease, as any Bill supported by Lord Selborne and Lord Cairns was likely to do. Possibly Mr. Gurney hoped that it might get through the Commons with equal ease, but suddenly everything was changed. Two things happened. In the first place, Mr. Gladstone came down and raised the Bill to

one of primary importance by giving notice of his intention to move six Resolutions, which really gave a summary of what he conceived to be the true principles of ecclesiastical legislation. In the next place, Mr. Disraeli discovered that the House of Commons took far more interest in the subject than he had conceived possible, and that the wish to do something to restrain one extreme party of the Church was very strong. He instantly changed his whole attitude. He announced that when a person like Mr. Gladstone produced a scheme of ecclesiastical legislation everything else must give way, and a fitting length of time must be devoted to its discussion. He further announced that the Ministry considered the passing of the Bill against which Mr. Hardy had spoken in a mild manner of the most vital importance, and that everything else must give way to it. Possibly nothing else need have given way to it, for the opinion of the House was so exceedingly strong in its favour that Mr. Gladstone withdrew his Resolutions, which he could not have got a dozen Liberals to support, and the Bill might have gone forward rapidly had not all of a sudden a new Bill cropped up which also appealed to the ecclesiastical feelings of contending parties. This was the Endowed Schools Bill, which consisted of two parts, one by which the functions of Lord Lyttelton's Commission were transferred to the Charity Commissioners, and one by which an interpretation was given to instruments of donation. Both provisions excited the most furious opposition, and for the first time this Session Mr. Gladstone found himself really leading his party. The character and conduct of the Commissioners were discussed hour after hour, until at last this part of the matter was settled by the Government using its majority. But the Opposition fought so very hard against the other part, the warnings given by those who hoped to benefit by it were so tremendous, the attack on the Ministry was so fierce, that at last Mr. Disraeli gave way, and the one solitary instance in which the Ministry seemed inclined to depart from the policy of their predecessors, and in which it seemed as if the change in the balance of parties and in the composition of the Ministry might be marked by a change in the mode of treating an important subject, ended in the Government retreating from the position they had taken.

The mischief had, however, been done, and the Ministry had to abandon, or chose to think it must abandon, all hope of carrying measures on which it had previously laid the greatest stress. The postponement of the Judicature Bill, which involves the putting off to an indefinite period the approaching change in the whole system of administering justice in the English higher Courts, is as great a failure as ever a weak Whig Ministry, tottering to its fall, had to lament, and is very damaging to the reputation of a strong Conservative Government just come into office. There can be no doubt, too, that these sudden inventions of policy by which things never thought of, or viewed a month ago with indifference, are suddenly elevated into the proudest aspirations of the Cabinet, slightly shake the reputation of the Government. They do not probably hurt it much, for the country is for the time in sympathy with a neutral and colourless policy. There is, too, a sense of general satisfaction that the change at the Foreign Office has completely fulfilled the anticipations of those who were sure that it was only a change of persons, and not in any way of policy. Lord Derby's policy is, in fact, Lord Granville's, and amounts to this, that the first duty of an English Foreign Secretary is to keep England out of war, and his second duty is to keep other nations out of war if he can, and, if he cannot, to look on and see them fight. Lord Derby, so far as he has had to speak on foreign politics at all, has been a model of caution. In fact, he was on one occasion so very cautious that he said in reply to Lord Russell that, if war must come sooner or later on the Continent, he wished it to come later, which inspired anxious foreigners with the notion that he was in the secret of an impending struggle. When questioned about the Suez Canal, he answered that M. Lesseps was too sensible a man not to know how to yield; and when questioned as to the rumours of favoritism shown by the French Government to the Carlists, he pushed the doctrine of non-interference so far as to answer that, if he had remonstrated with the French Government, he should have expected to have been asked "How are you hurt?" which certainly was as chilling an answer as could have been given by a Minister who was fondly looked to by ardent Conservatives to carry out a high-spirited foreign policy. Extreme caution is, however, what the English people in its present humour most likes to see in a Foreign Secretary, and Lord Derby's prudence in restricting the functions of the English representatives at the Brussels Conference within the narrowest possible limits has met with universal approval. In fact, caution is the prevailing characteristic of the Ministry; and even in enlarging the Empire by the acquisition of the Fiji Islands, Lord Carnarvon had the good sense to insist that the new territory should only be acquired if the terms of the acquisition were altogether what he could approve. Altogether, in spite of its legislative breakdown, the Ministry may be said to have got well through the Session. The vacancies caused by the decisions on Election Petitions have not disturbed the position of parties, and there is no reason to suppose that the country is not as well inclined to the Government as it was in February. Every one is quite content to wait and see whether next Session Mr. Disraeli and his colleagues cannot use their Parliamentary strength to some better and more fruitful purpose than they have used it in the Session that is now virtually at an end.

SCOTCH SATIRE.

A RATHER quaint trial for slander has recently taken place in Scotland, which illustrates the danger and difficulty of speaking ill of one's neighbours. As that is one of the most popular amusements of all classes in society, it is always interesting to take any hints as to the true rules of the game. It seems that there lives in the town of Ayr a distinguished local politician and banker, Mr. Gray. Mr. Gray has been Chairman of the Liberal Committee for many years, and has been a leader in all kinds of religious movements. He has been President of the Sabbath School Teachers' Union, elder of the U. P. Church, and so on. Naturally, therefore, he is hated by certain persons. A poem appeared in a newspaper of the opposite political persuasion which, according to him, was intended to give expression to these uncharitable feelings. The poem itself was headed "The Pharisee," and is ostensibly nothing more than a description of the abstract character. We need hardly observe that Scotchmen have long been divided into two classes, one of which considers itself to be composed of saints, and is considered by its rival to be composed of hypocrites, whilst the other enjoys the inverse reputation. The quarrel is an old one; and perhaps outside observers will be inclined to think that the lines of demarcation have been drawn a little too rigidly by party spirit. The poets of course generally sympathize with the less Puritanical class, and have before now expressed their feeling pretty forcibly. Ayrshire to English minds naturally suggests the name of Burns; and we need hardly say that many of Burns's most vigorous lines are directed against the excessively godly. There is not a more powerful satire in the language than the verses called "Holy Willie's Prayer"; and Southrons have thought that a portrait so powerfully drawn must have had some original to stand for it. It is surely not surprising that a Scotch versifier of the present day should have endeavoured to tread in the steps of his great predecessor. We cannot, however, conscientiously announce the appearance of a new poetical luminary in the columns of the *Ayrshire Observer*. We may content ourselves with quoting a single stanza, from which our readers may draw their own conclusions. The Pharisee is described in this way:—

He looks a babe, but never tires
Of drawing strings and pulling wires,
Of making balls of filth and mire,
For partisans to throw and fire;
Or setting traps, with craft not small,
Into which innocents may fall.

In other verses the Pharisee is described as a cheat, a hypocrite, a tyrant, a vindictive enemy, and as resembling a "fiend." The conclusion is pointed in the words:—

Look round your doors, your neighbours scan,
And tell me if you know the man.

Mr. Gray immediately came to the conclusion that he was himself the person attacked, and he insisted before the Court that everybody in the town at once recognized the portrait. As the defendant ultimately agreed to pay him 100*l.*, we must assume that the identity was sufficiently established. The highly general nature of the abuse might have been expected to evade any personal application. If there is only one man in Ayr who can be supposed even by the malicious to be injured by a general denunciation of hypocrisy, and that one man is in fact a person of the very highest character, we must congratulate the good people of Ayr on the high level of morality which they have attained since the days of Burns. There were indeed two or three touches which seemed to be susceptible of a special application. Mr. Gray, for example, had been hospitable to the clergy; and an oblique hint at his munificence was supposed to be couched in a couplet about "tea and toast." It is rather surprising that to administer those simple luxuries to the local clergy of Ayr is to set such a distinctive mark upon yourself that a poem in which the action is noticed must be understood to refer to you alone. However, Mr. Gray's "tea and toast" may have been distributed with special liberality, and perhaps there were some adjuncts which adapted them to the taste of the Scotch clergy. Other allusions may of course have been intelligible on the spot which escape the observation of persons who, like ourselves, never had the good fortune to hear of Mr. Gray's name before. We therefore hope that the principle established by the trial is simply that nobody may call Mr. Gray a cheat or a fiend, and not the wider principle that nobody in Ayr may abuse hypocrisy for fear lest some distinguished citizen should claim that the cap fits his head.

The point is one of which it is impossible for distant readers to form any trustworthy judgment. We cannot tell just where the sting lies, or what are the minute circumstances which show the animus of the writer. The question involved is of course a delicate one. A savage libel should not be allowed to escape because it is couched in general terms, nor a general denunciation of vice be punished because it may be twisted into a reference to some particular case. We learn, for example, from the trial that a minister in a Scotch church was supposed by one witness to have referred to Mr. Gray because he gave out what the witness calls the "cursing psalms." The minister declared that the psalms came in their regular order. Why any application to Mr. Gray should have been imagined passes our powers of conjecture. A very large part of the lessons would have to be excised from our services if any reference to the wicked could be condemned as a personal hit at one of the congregation. There is a story of an old lady who wrote down in her Prayer-book the names of her acquaintances

opposite to the Commandments which she supposed them to be specially in the habit of breaking; and we can believe that the fervour of her devotions was considerably increased by contemplation of these concrete cases. But the practice has some obvious moral objections; and we regret that the spirit which it indicates should be apparently so common in Ayr that any denunciation of the psalmist is spontaneously applied to the most prominent worshippers. At any rate, if this principle were adopted in regard to the press, the consequences would be awkward in the extreme. We should be unable to say a word about corruption without attacking the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time, or to denounce hypocrisy or tyranny without insulting the bishops and the judges. We may hope therefore that the precedent set by Mr. Gray's case will be applied with great caution; and we must confess that we have some doubts as to the wisdom of Mr. Gray's course. He has received damages indeed, but we fear that it will be very difficult to hear his name in future without thinking of the Pharisees. Dogberry is not generally supposed to have uttered a very wise aspiration when he wished that he had been written down an ass; and nobody should be too anxious to declare that the charge of hypocrisy could be brought against him even by the most unscrupulous satirist.

Meanwhile we cannot say much for the skill of the inhabitants of Ayr in satire. The art, indeed, is one which seems to be approaching extinction. Nobody can now write satires after the good old fashion of Pope and Dryden. It is not perhaps that we have grown less malevolent, but that society has grown so large that personal feeling is rather out of place. Satire of that variety is the natural product of a society composed of a few small cliques where everybody knows everybody else, and may therefore be confident that delicate painting of character will not be thrown away. Pope's lines upon Addison, which are perhaps the most finished example of the style, imply a close acquaintance such as rarely exists between two men who dislike each other at the present day. The satirist and his victim were members of two little camps, which were in constant contact, and of which every member knew all the weak places in the armour of every member of the other. The number of readers was so limited that any conspicuous writer filled a larger space than is now possible, and the merits of the portrait could be immediately recognized. If two of our most eminent poets at the present day regarded each other with jealousy, they would probably drift apart altogether; and each would be sensible that he had no right to bring his individual antipathies before a vast mass of readers, to most of whom both he and his antagonist were mere names on a title-page. The spirit which animated such writers doubtless survives in country towns, as is indeed proved by the present case. Mr. Gray is as well known, we may presume, to the inhabitants of Ayr as Addison and Pope were known to the frequenters of London coffee-houses; and therefore people are ready to see a personal application to him in what professes to be a general moral sentiment. But though the animus remains, the art, no longer cultivated by the first writers, has naturally become clumsy and ineffective. The satirist indulges in rough, clumsy abuse, and then tries to escape by not giving the name. The skilful artist knew how to say things which were equally vexatious, and a great deal more characteristic, and which yet could not be considered as libellous. He might, indeed, be brutal enough at times, as is sufficiently proved by Pope's assaults upon Lady Mary and Lord Hervey. More was then permitted to a man in good society than is now allowed to a scribbler in a country newspaper. But the real masterpieces of the art were those which dealt, not in coarse imputations, but in delicate descriptions of character, so fine that the deviation from fairness could scarcely be detected, and yet far more irritating than the most brutal abuse. Pope's Addison, for example, is held by all Addison's admirers to be radically unfair, and yet it is impossible to study it without feeling that so keen a painter must have had some justification for his false colouring. It represents a view of Addison's character which might be taken in good faith by an acute, though malicious, observer; and even its victim must have acknowledged to himself that, though untrue, it had an unpleasant likeness to the truth. That is the kind of libel which stings, the libel which makes us half fear that the view taken by our enemy may possibly be truer than the view which we are accustomed to take of ourselves. But to accomplish such work implies long and careful study of the art of saying disagreeable things, and a recognition of the first principle that the most unpleasant thing which you can say of a man is generally the truth, or, at any rate, something indistinguishable from the truth. The great school for such learning, which still survives, is in family quarrels; for people connected by so close a tie discover by constant practice what is the sore place, and what is the venom which most inflames it. Husbands and wives or brothers and sisters frequently acquire no mean skill in such matters; but perhaps it is not a matter for regret that public writers generally seem to be rather losing the power. Such satire as that of the *Ayrshire Observer* may be permitted to die without exciting the regrets of literary writers.

ROMAN CATHOLIC FOUNDERS.

THE debates on the Endowed Schools Act have brought up again some talk of a kind which is sure to come to light whenever it has a chance, but which shows what very vague

notions members of Parliament, as well as other people, have of the broad facts of the history of their country. The old question of Founders' wills naturally turns up, and with it of course turns up the particular question as to the will of that wholly mythical being the "Roman Catholic Founder." Would the Roman Catholic Founder wish his endowment to go to Protestant purposes? Would he not rather wish it to go to Protestant purposes than to altogether secular and godless purposes? We presume that all this goes on with an implied reservation of the power and right of Parliament to do what it pleases. As the right to make any foundation at all is a mere creation of the law, it must be borne in mind that the power that makes the law can do what it likes with the foundation. No one doubts that it can do so as a matter of fact; only some people seem to fancy that such a power is mere violence and usurpation, and not a right inherent in the supreme power of the country. This notion stands at one end; the somewhat brutal saying that "the pious Founder must go to the wall" stands at the other end. Between these two extremes come a great many shades of opinion, between which there is really no difference of principle. Many disputants whose practical conclusions differ widely from one another would probably agree in the general doctrine that there is a strong presumption in favour of Founders' intentions, and that they ought to be carried out when it is plain what they are, and when no case is made out to show that they ought not to be carried out. But, of course, as we see whenever these matters are discussed, this general agreement is far from hindering endless differences of opinion, both as to what the Founder's intentions were, and as to whether they can or ought to be carried out. And it is round about the religious difficulty that questions of this kind mainly rage. What would a Founder who lived in one state of things have done if he had lived in another state of things? What would a man who lived before the Toleration Act, when no foundation for the benefit of any religious body except the Established Church could have been lawful have done if he had lived now, when it is as lawful to make a gift for the benefit of one sect as of another? Doubtless, in each case of this kind there are many points to be weighed, both general and special to the particular foundation in hand. But the kind of talk which is most instructive, because it shows the greatest amount of historical confusion, is when the so-called Roman Catholic Founder is called up. He is not indeed called up very often, but he is always lying by, ready to be called up when he is wanted, to be held up in *terrorem* to be made use of to point a supposed argument from consistency. How, it is ever and anon asked, can people object to Church of England property being applied to Nonconformist purposes or secular purposes or any other kind of purposes, when they know that it was first of all applied to Church of England purposes only by being taken away from its former Roman Catholic owners? The Roman Catholic Founder whose gifts have been taken away to be applied to one kind of Protestant uses is in no way further wronged by their being again taken away to be applied to some other Protestant uses. Nay, he would have thought any kind of Protestant use so bad that he would have been just as willing that his gifts should go to altogether secular uses. If the masses and other acts of Roman Catholic worship which he ordained are put an end to, it is exactly the same to him whether their place is taken by one kind of Protestant worship or another, or indeed by no kind of worship at all.

As it happened, there was not very much of this kind of talk in the debates of which we speak, but things now and then had a tendency that way, and something about the Roman Catholic Founder was muttered once or twice. The wonder is that more was not said about him when his mention would have been so tempting. In all debates about disestablishment, disendowment, and the like, nothing is more common than the assumption that all ecclesiastical property, and all property of foundations like colleges and schools, which, though not strictly ecclesiastical foundations, have more or less of a religious element in them, were all, at the mysterious time called the Reformation, taken away from one religious body and given to another. This supposed fact is, as we have said, commonly used to point an argument from consistency. Yet surely the chief inconsistency lies the other way, when we find the same kind of people almost in the same breath talking about the novelties of Romanism, and yet willingly giving up the whole Western Church up to the sixteenth century as one and the same thing with the system which they denounce as novel and which they contrast with the earlier days of primitive purity. This notion about taking from one body or one Church and giving to another is one of those many cases where people do in a manner know the facts and the dates—that is, if they were minutely examined in the facts and dates, they would often make fairly right answers—but yet they allow themselves to think and speak in a way which is practically the same as if they had never heard of the facts and dates. It is hard to suppose that any man, it is hard to suppose that Sir William Harcourt himself, can be in such blackness of darkness as to the history of the sixteenth century as really to believe, when asked about it, that there were then in England two organized religious bodies called Roman Catholics and Protestants, and that property, offices, honours, and so forth were, at some time or other, by Henry, or Edward, or Elizabeth, taken from the one body and given to the other. It is hardly possible that they can really believe that what happened in the sixteenth century was the same thing as if the existing possessors of churches, colleges, schools, and what not, throughout England should be turned out of their possessions, and Roman Catholic or Presbyterian successors put in

their places. This is the only process which really answers to the description of taking from one religious body and giving to another; and it is hardly possible that any man, when it is put before him in this way, can really think that Henry or Edward or Elizabeth did anything of the kind. Yet in all discussions on the subject men allow themselves practically to think and speak as if they believed that it was so. The case is exactly the same as with another confusion against which we have often had to fight. Nobody, if the two dates are put before him, really believes that the year 1066 followed immediately upon the year 449; yet crowds of people practically think and speak as if all "the Saxons" lived at the same time. In both cases the confusion arises from a confused and unintelligent use of words. People are used nowadays to "Roman Catholic," "Protestant," "Church of England," and so forth, as names of religious bodies or systems of doctrine which are familiarly in use, and some of which are capable of a fairly accurate definition. Because certain changes which took place in the sixteenth century had the effect of freeing the Church of England from a great deal which it had in common with the modern Roman Catholic Church, they think that the Church of England before such changes must be the same body as the modern Roman Catholic Church, and not the same as itself since those changes. The old illustration about the man washing his face is very good as far as it goes, but it really does not meet the whole of the case. For the modern Roman Catholic Church cannot be looked upon as a man who has not washed his face; it would be truer to say that all religious bodies in the sixteenth century washed, or anointed, or scrubbed, or did something to their faces, but that they all did it with different kinds of soap. Till the modern Roman system was fixed by the Council of Trent, it is simply absurd to use words like "Roman Catholic" and the like.

People who talk about the Roman Catholic Founder talk as if a man who founded anything in the Church of England five hundred or a thousand years back was a believer in Roman Catholic doctrines in the same sense as a man who has lived since the Council of Trent. Indeed we are giving some of our adversaries a great advantage in drawing our line at the Council of Trent. We are not sure that we ought not rather to draw it at the proclamation of the last dogma of Infallibility. As it is not safe to assume that every mediæval Christian, if he had had the Tridentine doctrines set before him in a definite and controversial shape, would have chosen them rather than Anglicanism or Lutheranism, so it is not safe to assume that the great lights of the Gallican Church, if they had had to make their choice the other day, would necessarily have done like their unworthy successors, and not rather have thrown in their lot with the Old-Catholics. We cannot too often insist on the fact that there is all the difference in the world between the position of a man who vaguely and passively accepts a doctrine simply because it has not come into his head to question it, and the position of the man who deliberately accepts the same doctrine in a definite and controversial shape after it has been questioned. When people apply such words as "Roman Catholic foundations" and the like to the mediæval Church they forget this most important distinction. It is quite certain that the doctrines and ceremonies which prevailed in the English Church, say in the thirteenth century, were by no means exactly the same as the doctrines and ceremonies which prevail in the Roman Church now; but, if they were the same in every jot and tittle, there would be, in the minds of the vast mass who held them, the wide difference between holding a doctrine vaguely, passively, and as a matter of course, and holding the same doctrine definitely and controversially. The name "Roman Catholic," though logically it involves a contradiction, is practically a good enough name for those who definitely bind themselves to the dogma of either Pope Pius; but the name is simply absurd when applied to the mediæval Church of England, France, or anywhere else. And it reaches the height of grotesqueness when it is applied to a Church and nation whose whole life was, at least from the first Henry to the last, one long battle against Papal aggression. Perhaps the very queerest form which the confusion ever took is when, in Lord Lytton's story of Harold, an English Archbishop of the eleventh century is made to speak of his "authority as *Romish priest*."

The so-called Roman Catholic Founder is, in short, simply a Church of England Founder before we do not exactly know when—before the Reformation, whenever it happened. He gave to the Church of England as he found it. He prescribed such acts of worship as were lawful at the time of his foundation. The presumption is that, if he had lived under another state of the law, he would have also adapted his foundation to the law as he found it. Considering that, when the time of change did come, the great mass of the English people, clergy and laity, submitted to the various changes without any difficulty, the presumption certainly is that, if the change had happened at any earlier time, the English people and the founder of this or that school among them, would have conformed just as easily. The presumption is that the Founder who, say under Henry the Seventh, ordered such religious observances as were lawful under Henry the Seventh, would, if he had lived under Elizabeth, have ordered such religious observances as were lawful under Elizabeth. There is no kind of presumption that the Founder of a college or school would have taken a different course from the great mass of the nation; and there is the actual fact that some Founders actually lived to see the religious observances which they had enjoined altered by law. And we do not find that in such cases they made any kind of protest; they simply submitted themselves to the new state of things. Let us take the

case of Trinity College, Oxford. Its Founder, Sir Thomas Pope, was one whose heart was evidently with the old state of things. He must have conformed under Edward the Sixth, for he met with no molestation. But during that reign he retired from public life and held no public office. His statutes, drawn up in the reign of Mary, enjoined the religious observances which the law enjoined in the reign of Mary. Sir Thomas himself died during the first days of Elizabeth's reign, before any further changes were made, so we cannot tell what for certain he would have done; but it would not have been at all in conformity with his whole life if he had either sought martyrdom himself, or bidden the members of his foundation to seek martyrdom, on behalf of the system which was passing away. It happened that the first President was one of the few who suffered deprivation at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign for not conforming to the new laws; but a person more important than the President remained. Dame Elizabeth Pope, by a later marriage Dame Elizabeth Poulet, was co-Founder with her husband, and kept the Founder's powers for the rest of her days. Here was actually the so-called Roman Catholic Founder, living to see the rules which she had helped to lay down set aside, in so far as a higher power made them unlawful. She lived to see the religious services which she and her husband had ordained in their chapel exchanged for others, and she took it very calmly. We cannot look into her heart, but she made no open complaint. When the recusant President was deprived, all that she did was in due form to appoint another, who must have been ready to accept the Queen's supremacy, and to celebrate divine service according to the English Prayer-Book. For the rest of her days she went on making gifts to the college, appointing to vacancies in it, presenting to its advowsons, visiting the college, making no protest when the visitor, the puritan Bishop Horne, caused certain so-called "superstitious ornaments" to be removed from the chapel; in short, throughout conforming to the law, and not stirring up anybody else to do otherwise. In all this there was nothing exceptional in Lady Pope's conduct. She did simply what everybody else did, except a few specially zealous people on both sides. Here we have a so-called Roman Catholic Founder in real life, and we see how very patiently such a one took the reformation of her so-called Roman Catholic foundation before her own eyes. The presumption is that, if the like had happened in the thirteenth, fourteenth, or even fifteenth century, both founders and other people would have done what they actually did in the sixteenth.

ART SHOP.

THE present age, like most ages past, and probably also like most ages to come, has incurred a considerable amount of abuse from divers quarters. It is lightly spoken of by those who were born before it, who remember better days or days which they believe to have been better, and who compare the present time disadvantageously with that which was privileged to be theirs. It is ill-spoken of also by some who were born in it and are of it; who cannot therefore affect to remember anything better, but who yet, being little content with the present, look forward to something better in the future. It is probable that the same feelings of dissatisfaction with their time, and hope for a time to come, were entertained by many men who now look back with regret to the blessings which existed in their youth. Probably, too, the same regret for these present days will in future be entertained by those who are now railing at them; "and thus," as the Clown in *Twelfth Night* says, "the whirligig of time brings in his revenges." There are, however, many men of this age who, if not well pleased with its doings, at least think that it represents an onward step in the world's progress, and oppose this hopeful conviction to the lamentations of the malcontents.

On no subject perhaps do these two parties take issue more vigorously than on the advancement of art. While these wait for the loss of artists of earlier fame, and grieve that there are none such now, those contend that there are plenty such, and that, if there are not, it must at least be allowed that the love and appreciation of art are far more universal now than they ever were before; and that this fact in itself marks a distinct progress. That the love, real or apparent, of works of art extends over a wider area now than it did some years ago can hardly be denied. Whether the true appreciation of these works has kept pace with this is another question. No doubt there is something hopeful in the quantity of art schools which now exist in town and country. The cheerfully disposed point with delight to the crowd of young ladies of fashion, formerly employed in shopping, in reading trashy novels, or at best in doing needlework, who are now to be found attending lectures by art professors, or copying industriously from the antique. It may be said, in opposition to this, that in many cases they are urged by precisely the same motives which impelled them formerly, that their nature is like that of their predecessors, and that, being young ladies of fashion, they follow the fashion, not the love, of art. Even so, however, their present course of study may possibly be of some use to them, which could hardly be said of the novels or the shopping. Again, it must be said that art obtains almost as much favour in high places now as it did in the days of the king who stooped to pick up a painter's brush. Men already famous in learned professions add to their fame by contributing to the recognized art school of the kingdom. The meaning conveyed by the title of artist is so different from that which attached to it a few years ago, that one feels some surprise in reading that

Lord Farintosh spoke contemptuously of Clive Newcome as "a painter-fellow." All these things no doubt are good signs, and are evidence of an increasing respect and admiration for art and its works. On the other hand, the direct means by which art is to be fostered and encouraged must always be the existence of wealthy art patrons, and the wealth of these patrons is not always the exact measure of their taste and judgment. In some cases indeed it might be supposed to be so inversely, but it may be hoped that these cases are rare. Doubtless many kind protectors of the fine arts, famed for the purchase of first-rate pictures, or the giving of first-rate concerts, or both, are impelled more by the desire of acquiring a reputation like to that of Mæcenas than by any likeness between their tastes and those of their model. They plunge into the patronage of the arts with the same spirit in which a certain class of young men plunge into what is called a "vortex of dissipation"; they do it because it is supposed to be part of their position. Many years ago a case occurred on a circuit which runs through those places where the wealthy who delight in the possession of art treasures abound. The plaintiff was a rich manufacturer who sued a picture-dealer for breach of contract, the contract being that the defendant should furnish the plaintiff's galleries with a sufficiency of pictures "equal to sample." One may hope that it would be difficult now to find an exact parallel to this case, but undoubtedly something of the spirit in which the contract was made yet remains. While money is exchanged for some work which is good, it is given also for much which is not good. It is not impossible, however, that the contemplation of inferior art may be better than the contemplation of none at all. One of the greatest dramatic singers of the world, Mme. Malibran, could never form an idea of how she should act a part until she had seen it played by some one else. Whether she saw it well or ill played mattered little. If the acting was good, she seized upon its good points and made them her own, improving them in the process. If it was bad, she discerned its faults, and by learning what to avoid arrived at the idea of what to seek. Without assistance she could not grasp the conception of a character; a leading-string, however weak, was wanted to guide her along the road. Thus good may be derived from the study of faulty works of art. If there are some people for whom it would be good to contemplate inferior works of art, while the best are beyond their reach, there are others for whom it would be good to contemplate none at all.

There has arisen of late a new school of criticism. However one may disagree with the founders of this school in their views, one must recognize that those views are based on study and knowledge, and therefore are worthy of attention. But for the disciples of these founders there is not so much to be said. There is a certain class of young men who distinguish themselves by the title of "intellectual." They despise the frivolous follies of the day, but it may be doubted whether the so-called earnestness which is their pride is in any degree less frivolous, or less the result of a devotion to fashion, than the pursuits of other young men to whom nature is supposed to have been more parsimonious in the matter of intellect. The two classes follow different kinds of fashion; it is true, but the motives which impel them seem to be much the same. Perhaps if the two were weighed together, the balance would incline to the intellectual class, on the ground that they exhibit more daring in their worship of their goddess. Some knowledge of his subjects is necessary to the young man of fashion; he must be well informed, for instance, upon approaching fashionable engagements, marriages, and divorces. To the intellectual young man no knowledge is necessary, or rather he is far removed from the consideration of so trivial a matter. It is his privilege to discuss the hidden meaning of the most complex sonata without having any ear for music; to talk learnedly of the secret of the Venetians (which secret was, in fact, that the Venetians knew how to paint) without possessing any eye for colour. His special province is to have a keen critical faculty, a nice judgment in all artistic matters, and to exercise it in every direction. His gifts, like those of the great masters whose works he passes in review before him, are the result of direct inspiration. But he is more highly favoured than were those masters, in that he finds it unnecessary to cultivate his powers with patience and application. One particular sect of these philosophers must indeed be allowed to work hard in the service of their theories. These are they who have some little love for music, and on the strength of this affect a classical severity of taste. Vocal music they find trivial; instrumental music is, if merely beautiful, worthless; they require depth of thought expressed in orchestration. In support of this idea they abjure all such frivolities as the opera, from which they might derive some real enjoyment, and sit bravely through long movements of stringed instruments which less intellectual persons would be apt to call tiresome. They have their reward in the pedantic talk which they indulge in afterwards. The most irritating section of the intellectual school consists perhaps of those who are judges of pictures, and, taking the technical terms of painting and music, with neither of which arts probably they have more than a superficial acquaintance, mix them together into a new and horrible jargon. Following the unpleasant fashion set them, it must be allowed, by some to whom they may rightly look up, they describe pictures as symphonies in green, harmonies in white, and *notturnos* in all sorts of colours. Their delight in this new method of expression leads them to carry it further, it may be hoped, than its originators intended. They will beg you to admire the tremulous tones of an atmosphere, the swell of a foreground, or the diapason of scarlet in a sunset. They discourse

learnedly of ascending and descending scales of colour, of melodious passages running through the middle distance, of the phrasing of a picture, and of the key in which it is set. When they wish to praise a painter, they say that he has a fine eye for harmony. It has not yet, we believe, come to pass that those who more particularly affect musical knowledge speak of a composer possessing a fine ear for colour. It would be no more ridiculous, however, to hear of the middle distance and *morbidezza* of a quartet than of those things which we have mentioned above, and of others like them. The extraordinary fluency and extraordinary unintelligibility of these philosophers' disquisitions reminds one of the nonsense rhyme concerning the old man who "walked by the Trent, and talked to himself as he went, but so loud and so much, and moreover in Dutch, that no one could tell what he meant." After listening to them for some time one is inclined to doubt whether the universal spread of art, or rather of a superficial acquaintance with art, is an unmixt blessing. They are so well contented with themselves, so thoroughly convinced that the words which they speak are the words of wisdom, that there seems no hope of their ever straying from the paths which they have made peculiarly their own. "Shop" of all kinds is apt to be tiresome even when talked by those who are well versed in their subject; when talked by those who are not so well versed, its weariness assumes gigantic proportions. It is an old and true saying that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. Certainly a little knowledge in the matter of art is a dangerous thing for the friends and acquaintances of those who possess it.

THE ETHICS OF TYRANNICIDE.

THE German papers are still busily engaged in discussing what they call "the Kissingen attempt," and the probable degree of complicity of the Ultramontane party in the crime. The Government showed its good sense in at once releasing the suspected priest Hanthaler, when the circumstances which had very naturally led to his apprehension were satisfactorily explained. Whether it is equally well advised in closing the Catholic Unions in Germany is another question. That political assassination has never answered its purpose can hardly be maintained with such cases as that of Ravallac before our eyes; but in the present instance the folly of the enterprise is even more conspicuous than its criminality; Ultramontanism had nothing to gain by its failure, and everything to lose by its success. Tyrannicide, like persecution, is usually a losing game, and it would be pleasant to believe that what is happily so shocking to modern sentiment is devoid of even all plausible excuse. But facts will hardly allow us to indulge in this convenient optimism. For a vulgar fanatic, like Kullmann, nobody of course has a word to say. But there is a whole literature, ancient and modern, bearing on the general subject of tyrannicide, and the practice has been advocated, under certain specified conditions, from the most various and opposite points of view, political and religious. Certainly it is no peculiarity of Ultramontanism. When Sarpi was stabbed on the bridge of La Guerra at Venice, he exclaimed, "*Cognosco stilum Curia Romanæ*." And it is very possible—though there is no direct evidence for it—that the attempt may have been authorized by the Pope. Such a method of getting rid of troublesome opponents had unquestionably been recommended by Catholic writers of the period, and both Pius V. and St. Charles Borromeo had approved of it. But Sarpi must have known that they were only endorsing his own principles. His posthumous treatise on the Venetian Republic distinctly advises the removal by secret murder of citizens who have become too influential for the interests of the State, and suggests poison as the most convenient means of effecting it. It is clear, however, from Sarpi's diaries, which are also preserved to us, that he rejected not only Catholicism, but Christianity. His defence of secret assassination is therefore based on purely political grounds. But it is a curious coincidence, if nothing more, that, while most of his works were placed on the Roman Index, the treatise on the Republic—which may be compared in more than one respect with Machiavelli's *Prince*—escaped censure.

But we must go much further back than the time of Sarpi for the origin of the doctrine of tyrannicide. In this, as in other points, the popular heroes of Athenian legend illustrate in its darkest colours the accepted standard of Greek morality; and Brutus was no less idolized as a hero among Roman Republicans of a later date than Harmodius and Aristogeiton among the Greeks. The Scriptural examples of Ehud and Deborah and Judith have been as freely pressed into their service by the apologists of tyrannicide. With the revival of learning in Europe, and the liberal and classical tone of feeling which accompanied it, this doctrine revived also. It had been already maintained in an abstract form by St. Thomas Aquinas, at least as applied to the case of tyrants *in titulo*, i.e. tyrannical usurpers. But it acquired a fresh importance when at the opening of the fifteenth century Jean Petit, a theological professor at Paris, publicly maintained the thesis that it is lawful for subjects to slay a disloyal tyrant. Such a view was of course quite out of harmony with the instincts of Gallicanism, and accordingly it was denounced by Gerson and condemned by the Council of Constance; but the decree is rejected altogether by some Ultramontane writers as not binding, while others, like Suarez, explain it as only forbidding the destruction of tyrants *in regimine*, i.e. lawful sovereigns who govern unjustly, as dis-

tinguished from usurpers who have no right to reign at all. Amid the fierce conflicts of the Reformation so convenient a weapon for disposing of enemies in high places was eagerly grasped at on both sides, and Protestant as well as Catholic—especially Jesuit—writers came forward to defend the classical tradition on the subject, which was also exhibited on the French stage by Grévin in the drama of the *Death of Caesar*. If Pius V. sanctioned attempts on the life of Elizabeth, and even Sixtus V., one of the ablest and most upright of modern pontiffs, publicly eulogized the assassination of Henry III., there was no want of influential Protestants to applaud the murder of the Duke of Guise and of Cardinal Beaton. The Jesuits took a prominent part in the discussion, and among the Jesuits, Mariana. Now the case of Mariana is in many ways a remarkable one. He is not only by common consent one of the very ablest, but perhaps the most liberal-minded and straightforward writer the Order ever produced, exactly the one who corresponds least to the popular conception of a Jesuit. With him, as Mr. Lecky very justly remarks, "the interests of the Church, though never forgotten, never eclipse or exclude the interests of the people, and all the barriers that are raised against heresy are equally raised against tyranny." He wrote in an exclusively Catholic nation under the rule of Philip II. Yet Mariana is unquestionably among Catholic divines the chief authority in favour of tyrannicide, and its most uncompromising advocate. He maintains in express terms the right of a nation to rebel against a tyrannical sovereign, however legitimate may be his title, and, if no other means are effectual, to resort to the *ratio ultima* of assassination. Nor is this teaching at all confined to the case of sovereigns deposed by the Pope; it is defended, he argues, by the voice of nature and the common sense of mankind, as witnessed in the universal admiration of Harmodius, Aristogiton, and Brutus. The only reservation made by Mariana—and that seems to be more a matter of sentiment than reason—is against the use of poison, which Sarpi, as we saw just now, prefers to more open methods of attack. Indeed the honest liberalism of the writer, not to say his democratic temper, comes out very clearly in his sharp criticism on the monarchical constitution of his own Order. It is certainly surprising that the book *De Rege* should have appeared as it did, *permissu superiorum*. But the author found several Jesuit theologians to follow in his steps, though they trod more cautiously. With the period of the great religious wars the controversy appears to have died away, and few Jesuits of later days have approached Mariana either in originality or in the courage of their convictions.

It will not perhaps be difficult from what has been said already to understand in some degree how a theory which so deeply outrages our notions of right and wrong may yet, under different social conditions, have commended itself to many of the best and wisest men of their day. In the first place, it is the natural tendency of philosophers in an early stage of civilization to discuss questions in the abstract with very little regard to the thousand collateral considerations of which subsequent experience would often constrain them to take account. And as a mere abstract theory there is no lack of plausibility in Mariana's point of view. Royal power, he argues, is derived mediately or immediately from the people, who may revoke their sanction when it is grossly misused. This should of course be done through constitutional machinery whenever it is possible, but when the very tyranny to be resisted renders it impossible, he contends that the natural right of self-defence comes into play, and the prince who has made himself "a public enemy" may be put to death by any one who will undertake the deed in the general interests of the State. Then again the apparent sanction of such acts, if performed for a national and religious object, in the Old Testament, would inevitably exert a powerful influence over the minds of Christian writers in an age when there was no idea on any side of degrees of inspiration, or of a moral development in the history of the chosen people, or of any of those other methods of interpretation by which a modern divine would turn the edge of such *prima facie* difficulties. Nor can we of course leave out of sight the more ignoble motives which would prompt, not the higher spirits like Mariana, but many who followed in their wake or were fatally influenced by their teaching to seize so ready a means of gratifying the impulse of religious or political animosity. It is in fact, as all experience testifies, precisely this latter class of persons into whose hands the doctrine really plays, and even if its theoretical claims to attention were more forcible than they are, that fact would alone be its sufficient condemnation. Mariana points out with regret how few persons there are who have the courage to risk their own lives for the common welfare in this manner, but he does not add that those few are pretty sure to be the very last persons capable of forming a sound judgment, even on his own principles, as to whether the emergency is such as to justify their intervention. Nor can it safely be forgotten that sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. The plea urged by Mariana for Clement the Dominican, and which might be urged far more persuasively for Charlotte Corday—whose sincere desire "to sacrifice her life for her country," as she herself expressed it, is beyond all question—may also be taken to justify Orsini or the murderer of Abraham Lincoln. Henry IV. of France was a miserable ruler, and Marat was something much worse, but Ravallac was probably quite as sincere as Clement or Charlotte Corday. We need not indeed doubt the sincere fanaticism of Kullmann, nor is his belief that Prince Bismarck is unjustly oppressing his Church at all peculiar to him or even to his co-religionists. It would be difficult to show on Mariana's

principles that his act was not at least excusable, supposing it had been at all probable that, if successful, it would accomplish the object in view; and the ignorant fanatic who fires the shot is the last person to be able to form any very rational appreciation of the relation of means to ends. It may hardly appear a satisfactory conclusion to arrive at, but the truth is that, with tyrannicide as with persecution, it is easier to lay down a positive rule by which, in the present stage of civilization, men of all creeds and all parties will consent to be judged, than to establish a theory open to no intellectual objection. It is to be feared that, if the circumstances of the sixteenth century were to return, the sixteenth-century code of public morality would be again put forward, but that is at all events no excuse for tolerating it in the nineteenth.

NICE NEW THINGS IN COMPANIES.

THE most recent effort of philanthropy is directed to the establishment of an aquarium "in the heart of London." We should have thought that, if the Crystal Palace Aquarium did not suffice for the wants of the metropolis, another similar exhibition might have been opened at the Albert Hall, and a third at Alexandra Park. However, a Company is to be formed for establishing an Aquarium and Summer and Winter Garden on a site "which may fairly be termed unrivalled," and in connexion therewith to afford facilities generally for the promotion and encouragement of artistic, scientific, and musical tastes. Of course, if a capital of 200,000*l.* is to be raised and spent, facilities will be afforded, not only generally, but particularly, for the display of various kinds of taste. We should have thought indeed that summer and winter gardens and an aquarium might have been provided to any extent at South Kensington, and that if there is anywhere 200,000*l.* which wants spending, Mr. Cole C.B. might be induced to give his valuable assistance in promoting and encouraging artistic taste by disbursing that amount. Seriously, is it possible to believe that this enterprise can be successful, or is that consideration disregarded by its projectors? We thought the building of the Alexandra Palace a bold scheme, and the rebuilding of it still more daring, but this idea of an aquarium at Westminster is sublime in its audacity. The projectors announce, or rather assume, that this combined summer and winter garden and aquarium at Westminster is one of the manifest necessities of the age. It is to be erected close to the Houses of Parliament, the Law Courts, the Public Offices, and the Abbey, and we are to understand that the frequenters of all these places are struggling to support the burden of existence until that happy day when an aquarium shall be opened in their immediate neighbourhood. The briefless barrister will be able without any violation of truth to place upon the door of his chambers in the Temple an announcement that he is "gone to Westminster," when he is really availing himself of the facilities afforded by this Company for getting his artistic, scientific, and musical tastes promoted and encouraged. When we first heard of the undertaking we hastily concluded that the proper site for it would have been Leicester Square. We thought that by uniting the Alhambra with the enclosure, and, if possible, rehabilitating the Great Globe, the musical, artistic, and scientific tastes of the metropolis might have been adequately developed. But we were at the moment unaware that lawyers, members of Parliament, public officers, and Dean and Chapter would thus be disappointed in the desire of their hearts for an aquarium in their immediate neighbourhood. The Council of Fellows of this Society will deserve a high place in the list of benefactors of mankind. Their names, which may be read at length in the prospectus, are described in it generally as "well known in the scientific, artistic, financial, and fashionable world," and it is open to any Fellow to appropriate mentally to himself any or every part of the distinction thus ascribed to the collective Council. We forbear to conjecture which names of the list have been selected as those of men well known in the financial world. It does not appear whether a Fellow is required to take even a single share, and the pecuniary liability would of course be limited by the amount of shares taken, but it is rather an alarming consideration that the names of the Council are held out in the prospectus as a "guarantee" that the undertaking will be carried out on sound principles, and that the Aquarium will become a fashionable resort.

It is with reference more particularly to the fashionable character of the Aquarium that we permit ourselves to regret that Leicester Square could not have been compared with the site which the projectors declare "unrivalled." A popular play of the last century represents a family from the country driving to Cranbourne Alley to buy bonnets for the wife and daughters, and we believe that the locality has sustained its reputation to the present time. We venture to think, however, that a fashionable character may be sustained even at Westminster sufficiently to exonerate the Council from any liability on their guarantee. Plays in this as well as in the last century represent the manners of the age, and in a recent play the hero was engaged to meet three different ladies at the same hour at the Aquarium at Brighton, while a fourth lady, for whom he had shortly before declared his undying love, happened to visit the Aquarium at that precise time. It might perhaps deserve the consideration of the Council that matrimonial advertisements are increasing, and that no plan can be more

suitable for enabling a gentleman or lady to judge of the personal qualifications of a correspondent than that of requesting her or him to wear a pink bow or a blue tie and to walk as nearly as convenient to the Sea Devil at the Aquarium. An amended prospectus might announce that the Council had discovered and were proceeding to supply a manifest necessity of the age. They would remark that there are thousands of persons of each sex, in all conditions of life, who through various circumstances are unable to meet with suitable partners, and would gladly change their condition if they had an opportunity of doing so. In order to facilitate the accomplishment of these natural and laudable desires, more than one periodical has been started as a medium of communication between gentlemen who want wives and ladies who would be well pleased to find husbands. But in all such correspondences the difficulty is almost insuperable of conveying a correct idea of the appearance of the lady or gentleman who is willing to receive and reciprocate affection. Self-portraiture may be marred by conceit or diffidence, and the carte which is usually required may produce an imperfect or even erroneous estimate of face and figure. The Council might go on to observe that among recent advertisers is one lady who ascribes to herself "good figure, blue eyes, dark hair," and another lady "of title, possessed of 20,000*l.*," who asserts that she is "aged twenty-four, tall, fair, very accomplished," but the Council have sometimes perused at railway stations and elsewhere advertisements of "very superior old" sherry, and have found that the article did not answer to description. The Council have considered that sherry may be purchased by the single bottle, and even tasted before buying, but that a wife must be taken, if they may be pardoned the expression, *en bloc*, and that no return of the article for misfit or unsuitability is permitted. The Council "endorse" the sentiment of the editor of a periodical devoting itself to the promotion of marriage, that a man cannot hope to prosper in the world without the co-operation of a wife who may reward his labour "with an enduring smile," but they think that perhaps an "endearing smile" might be more generally appreciated. The Council, moved by these considerations, would announce their determination to apply their scientific, artistic, financial, and fashionable experience to the utilization of the "unrivalled position" of the proposed Aquarium for the promotion of meetings between ladies and gentlemen which might lead to marriages. We had almost forgotten to observe the important announcement which actually appears, that the Committee, "under the sanction and with the co-operation of the Council, have already under consideration the organization of some of the most exclusive and fashionable fêtes, fancy bazaars, and conversations of the season of 1875," and that "advantages of exceptional value" are thus offered to early applicants for shares. It is obvious that a principle analogous to that of natural selection would thus be made available to the Council in their suggested undertaking for the advancement of matrimonial projects. Descriptions by ladies of their own charms may exaggerate, photographs may excite, although they very seldom do, expectation of non-existent beauties; but when the Committee of this Society, sanctioned and supported by the Council, organizes an exclusive and fashionable fête, we must all feel satisfied that the ladies and gentlemen who may be present at it will enjoy "advantages of exceptional value" in one another's company. They will meet at an "institution" where their artistic, scientific, musical, and matrimonial tastes will be guided and encouraged by a body of noblemen and gentlemen eminently qualified for the benevolent office which they have assumed.

Almost equally philanthropic in purpose is the Railway Travellers' Protection Society, of which a prospectus states that its object is "to endeavour to secure protection for the public in the use of railways." Meetings of this Society will be held periodically, at which papers will be read, and suggestions received, with reference to the improvement of the railway policy of the kingdom. We assume that the papers will be printed, and an effort will be made to obtain readers for them; so that this is really a proposal for setting up a joint-stock literary enterprise of no very lively kind. The suggestion is, as far as we are aware, new, and it may possibly be advantageous, but we think it might be improved by an extension of the principle of limited liability. If a subscriber reads a foolish paper at a meeting of the Society, and that paper is afterwards published, we submit that the author only, and not the Society, ought to undergo the penalty of ridicule. The Railway Companies are likely to care little for such an exceedingly mild form of antagonism as this, and they would probably be willing to make an arrangement with this Society on the footing which Frederick the Great said existed between him and his subjects—namely, that the Society should say what it pleases and the Companies do what they please. The Society will receive written statements of grievances from members, and will assist them in representing such grievances to the Companies, the Government authorities, or through the press to the public, with a view to their arrangement, if possible, by other means than litigation. This announcement is even more remarkable than the prospectus of the Aquarium either is or might be made with our proposed addition. The idea that an "exclusive and fashionable fête" could be organized on the principle of a Joint-Stock Company is less absurd than that of obtaining from a Railway Company redress of a grievance by other means than litigation. It may be anticipated, whenever public opinion, evoked

by this Society or otherwise, produces the slightest effect upon the proceedings of Railway Companies, that other prodigies will occur, and as the Aquarium is designed to be "the most complete and instructive in the world," a place should be provided in it for the Sea Serpent, who may be expected to arrive at Westminster Hall for the express purpose of seeing a Railway Company pay damages under moral suasion. If there be a serious intention of removing the Monument from its present site, we would suggest that it be placed in the centre of the Aquarium for the convenience of the Sea Serpent, who might arrange himself in tasteful festoons upon it. Perhaps a column which "lifts its head and lies" might be suitably appropriated for the reception of the Sea Serpent whenever he may appear.

CO-OPERATIVE STORES.

SIR THOMAS CHAMBERS has fired his shot and the members of Co-operative Associations are still unharmed except so far as they have injured themselves by their own mistakes. Even the professed advocate of the shopkeepers could not deny that co-operation as such was beyond the reach of Parliament. Indeed he was pleased to allow that even Civil servants were not forbidden by any principle of law to pay ready money or to carry home their own purchases. The gist of his complaint was that Co-operative Associations are no longer mutual because they supply not only their own members but also the public outside. Sir Thomas Chambers first constructs an arbitrary definition of membership and then decides who it is that is excluded by it. In all these Associations, as far as we know, the right of dealing at the Stores is restricted to members—that is, to persons who buy a yearly ticket. In one case the right to buy a yearly ticket has become a privilege, admission to which can only be gained by long waiting. What Sir Thomas Chambers means to quarrel with is the extension of the right of membership to persons who are not shareholders. The only difference between a shareholder and a ticket-holder is that the former has contributed, or represents some one who has contributed, towards the cost of starting the Association. We see no reason why the term mutual should be arbitrarily restricted to one of these classes as long as both have an equal share in the benefits of the Association. It is quite true that when Co-operative Associations begin to make profits out of those who buy from them, they do cease to be mutual associations; and if Sir Thomas Chambers had confined himself to this aspect of the question, he might have made out a stronger case. The moment that a Co-operative Store abandons its original object of selling the best goods at the cheapest rate to its members, and begins to sell goods to one class of its members for the profit of another class, it becomes nothing more than a general shop conducted on the principle of limited liability. It is not wonderful that Sir Thomas Chambers's clients should dislike a system which converts customers into rival traders, but it is not very clear how the members of the Civil Service are to be forbidden to trade in one way more than in another. It would be just as reasonable for a carrier to complain that Civil servants have driven him off the road by taking shares in Railway Companies as for a shopkeeper to complain that he is injured by Civil servants taking shares in Supply Associations. There is trading in one case just as much as in the other. Of course it is open to Parliament to decree that every moment of a Civil servant's time shall be considered to be at the disposal of the Government which employs him, to abolish the division of the day into office hours and hours in which he is his own master, and to provide him with a proper amount of papers to take home with him every evening, if indeed under this public-spirited arrangement he is allowed to go home at all. But until this statute is passed the old theory remains in force, and a public servant is only bound to give to the public the time during which he is doing the work assigned him by the authorities of his office. When that work is done, whether at the office or at home, he becomes a free man, and may spend what remains to him of the day in any manner that pleases him. Whether he is writing a book, helping to manage a shop, or dancing at the Argyll Rooms, is no concern of his employers. They have contracted for the performance of certain public duties, and so long as these are performed they have no right to declare what other private duties he may or may not undertake in addition. When Mr. Forsyth argued that Civil servants who found time to act as directors of trading associations must either be too highly paid; or have too little to do, he was clearly speaking to his constituents rather than to the House of Commons. If the fact proves anything, it is that Civil servants who seize every opportunity of spending their leisure hours in some profitable employment must be paid too little. But for this a tired clerk would hardly sit down as soon as he has left his office to go over fresh columns of figures, and to do for his Association at home what he has been doing for the public while he was away from home.

Mr. Macdonald pointed out that the superior cheapness of the articles sold is not the only attraction of Co-operative Stores. Buyers want to get a good article as well as to pay no more than a fair price for it, and until Co-operative Stores were established the former object was almost as difficult to ensure as the latter. At all times of course there were some thoroughly respectable retail dealers who could be trusted to give their customers an unadulterated article. But with these exceptions adulteration had become, as Mr. Bright described it, only a form, and a very popular

form, of competition. If a grocer found it impossible to supply genuine sugar as cheaply as his neighbour, he had the option of raising the price or lowering the quality, and he usually chose the latter. No one likes to be asked more for the same article in one shop than in another; and consequently the rival traders fixed the same prices and trusted to the superior ingenuity which each thought that he could bring to bear on the process of adding the sand to give him some slight advantage in the race for business. The Co-operative Store for the first time put it into the power of everybody to buy pure goods. An Association which exists to supply its members with the best goods at the cheapest rates has no motive for adulterating what it sells. This is a consideration which is sometimes lost sight of. There are shops which undertake to supply goods for ready money at the same prices as the Co-operative Stores; and as this is becoming a rather frequent profession, it is to be presumed that it is found to be a popular one. A little reflection ought to teach people that the cheapness of a Co-operative Store is the compound result of ready money payments, diminished cost of distribution, and no profits. The shopkeeper who offers to charge Co-operative prices, provided that he will pay him ready money, trusts to your forgetting that he will still have to pay for the carts and horses which deliver the goods, and to make a living profit on the capital invested and the labour bestowed. Considering the additional items of expense, it is impossible that he should sell the same goods that the Co-operative Store sells, and only charge the same prices. But he may easily sell inferior goods, and charge the same prices, and then all will go smoothly. The buyer will think that he is spending as little as if he went to the Store, while he is saved all thought about bringing home what he has bought. The seller will know that the goods which he has sold at the price charged for them at the Store have really cost him very much less than they cost the Stores, and is as ready to take his profits in that shape as in any other. The absolute guarantee against adulteration afforded by co-operation cannot survive the novel practice of selling goods at a profit. A different guarantee is substituted for it, that of the respectability of the seller, but this is the same in kind as that offered by many shops. The directors of trading associations may be above adulterating their goods, but they will have precisely the same motive for adulterating them that any other shopkeeper has—the motive, namely, of getting the best price for inferior articles.

If retail traders were wise men, they would set to work to help themselves instead of asking the member for Marylebone to help them. In one respect many of them have done this already. Ready-money dealings are very much more common than they once were, and the disuse of long credit is in a great measure to be traced to the popularity of Co-operative Stores. But, as we have just seen, it is not cheapness alone that the Co-operative Store gives its customers. The certain purity of the goods is to many persons even a more attractive feature of the system. There is no reason why this feature should not be equally present in the rival system. A writer in the *Cornhill Magazine* proposed some months ago that shopkeepers should form themselves into an Association which should pledge its members to give a correct description of every article sold, maintain competent analysts of good professional repute to test any sample offered for analysis by a purchaser, and return the price for any article which failed to stand this test. If thoroughly respectable dealers became members of this Association in the first instance, it would soon be understood that shops which remained outside it were afraid to face the ordeal which membership involved. It might also be expedient in the case of new members that the heads of the Association should exercise some supervision over the quality of the goods sold, without waiting for the purchaser to take the initiative. We do not say, however, that even with this precaution retail traders will find the future as easy as the past has been. The number of shops is far too great for all, or nearly all, of them to be profitable to those who keep them. A glut of distributors must have the same results as a glut of producers. Only a certain number of men can live by bringing goods to the doors of the customers who want them, and those for whom there is no business must seek a livelihood in other ways. The whole tendency of recent improvements as regards facilities of communication points to the concentration of distribution in fewer hands. But as regards the Co-operative Stores the shopkeepers can very well hold their own if, instead of shrieking half-articulate denunciations of the wickedness of the system, they set themselves to inquire what it is that has made it popular. The Stores are not crowded with customers without a reason. People go there because they can get pure goods at a moderate price. Tradesmen who give equally pure goods and charge only so much more than the Stores as will pay for the greater conveniences afforded to the purchaser and give them a reasonable profit, will not often find that the Stores are preferred.

ASSIZE BUSINESS.

THE Grand Jury at Guildford have made a presentment declaring their opinion that the holding of Assizes for the county of Surrey should be continued as heretofore. It is right that the Assizes for that county should be continued, but not that they should be continued as heretofore. The Judicature Act will give facilities for trying in London the causes which belong to London, and there will then be no longer any occasion for taking down these causes for trial to Kingston in the spring or to Guild-

ford or Croydon in the summer. There has been in the last thirty years an enormous increase of the legal business of London without any corresponding increase of the means of disposing of it. The number of judges of the Courts of Common Law has been augmented, but the times within which the services of these judges can be made available have not been extended. The last day of Trinity Term was the 12th June and next day the *nisi prius* Courts began to sit at Westminster, whence after a fortnight they moved to Guildhall, where they sat a fortnight. Thus by the 11th July the trying of causes in London was finished and would not be resumed until November. It is possible to have two or even three judges of a Court sitting with juries at the same time, but it is not possible that these judges should sit after about the 11th of July, because the circuits, as at present arranged, take nearly all of them away from London before that day. At the present moment fourteen judges are on circuit. One remains in town to attend at Chambers, one judge is ill, two judges are supposed to be holding themselves in readiness for the trial of election petitions, and thus the whole number of eighteen judges is accounted for. The circuits will extend more or less into the month of August, and when they are over the judges who have held them will fairly have earned a holiday. There can be no doubt that the arrangement of the Assizes might be improved so as to effect some saving of judicial time, but it may be worth while to continue to hold Assizes in every county, even if it were necessary for this purpose to appoint additional judges. The *Times* says that "the proper course is to readjust the circuits so as to avoid as much as possible any waste of judicial strength," and no doubt this may be done to a limited extent. It might be ascertained beforehand how many causes there will be to try, and the attendance of judges to try them might be arranged accordingly. If it be easy, as is urged, to bring suitors of the home counties to the judges in London, it is, or might be, equally easy to bring the judges to the suitors at Guildford or Maidstone.

The *Times* displays strange ignorance or carelessness in discussing in a leading article this matter of the rearrangement or possible abolition of certain circuits. "There is often a cruel delay in the trial of prisoners," and this cruelty occurs in what the *Times* calls "a small circuit," where, if a man is committed immediately after the Summer Assizes, he cannot be tried until the Spring Assizes of the following year, unless a special Winter Assize should happen to be held. It is of course very unfortunate that if one man commits a serious crime half-a-dozen other men cannot be induced to follow his example. The rule, we believe, is not to hold a Winter Assize unless the number of prisoners in gaol amounts to a certain figure. If that figure be not reached, a "cruel delay" occurs in trying prisoners, which, however, is mitigated by the consideration that the greater number of prisoners are guilty of the crimes imputed to them. A "small circuit" seems to mean a circuit where few heinous offences are committed, and the inhabitants of such a circuit may perhaps think that its comparative freedom from serious crime is creditable, or, at least, ought not to be made ground for depriving them of an ancient and valuable privilege. The *Times*, however, will lead them to think otherwise. "Such cases are a very serious reflection upon the system which permits their continuance." A man who commits a murder in Kent in August night, as perhaps the *Times* would say, be brought to London to be tried; and therefore we will suppose the case of a man who commits a murder in Somersetshire. What is to be done with him? Is this one of the cases which are a serious reflection on the system which permits them? There are apparently only two alternatives—to take this prisoner to Exeter for trial, or to bring him up to London. The latter course has never, we believe, been suggested, and to the former we see serious objection. When we are upon the subject of "cruel" proceedings it ought not to be forgotten that it is a considerable hardship to take a man out of his county to be tried. It is difficult enough for a poor man to produce evidence as things are, and if this difficulty is to be enhanced, it certainly ought not to be done under the pretext of redressing cruelty. If a prisoner consented to be tried in an adjoining county, he might be taken thither, but otherwise he ought to be permitted to undergo the consequences, whatever they might be, of having committed a serious crime in August on a "small circuit." If the crime should be of that very serious nature for which hanging is the penalty, the prisoner would be less likely to complain of the "cruel delay" in bringing him to trial.

But although the *Times* has erred in the details of the Assize arrangements, it is right in alleging the existence of a grave evil. The Assizes at Guildford opened with a list of upwards of one hundred and fifty causes, of which probably one hundred have no connexion with the county of Surrey. In the majority of these causes witnesses will be taken down from London. There are probably claims arising out of accidents, in which Railway Companies are defendants, and in these cases eminent physicians and surgeons will be brought down from London at heavy expense to the parties and great inconvenience to themselves. A claim for an accident on the Great Northern Railway can have as little to do with the county of Surrey as any case that can be suggested, and if it be necessary to try such a case before November, provision ought to be made for trying it in London. On Monday next the absurdity of doing London business at Guildford will be enhanced by the occurrence of the Bank Holiday. If parties and witnesses go down on Sunday they will incur great expense, and perhaps fail to obtain accommodation, and if they attempt to go down on Monday, they will probably not arrive until too late. The plain

truth is that, independently of the extensive proposals of the Judicature Act, provision ought to have been long since made for keeping open the *nihi prius* Courts in London at least until the 10th August. It is wonderful that the manifest interest of attorneys and counsel should not have induced them to urge this simple reform upon the Legislature years ago. The Divorce Court and the Courts of Chancery have been sitting in the present week, and why should not the *nihi prius* Courts sit also? There would be more litigation if there were more facilities. The ordinary Englishman likes a stand-up fight, even if he be beaten in it, but he gets tired of delay, and does not care to have his case disposed of by a barrister sitting in a private room. The history of the last Maidstone Assize, as given in the columns of the *Times*, does not support the proposal which that journal favours for abolishing the Home Circuit. The Assize began on Tuesday in last week, and it would have lasted beyond Tuesday in this week if all the causes entered had been tried. But on Tuesday in this week the judges who had been employed at Maidstone began work at Guildford. Several of the cases which stand for trial at Maidstone were eminently local. Thus there was a case as to a right of way at Bexley, which would have occupied a day or more in trying. As a three-day case was before it, the parties made it a *remantel* to next Assizes. We believe that the *locus* in this case is slightly nearer to London than to Maidstone, and it may be said that there is no reason why this case should not be tried in London, to which we should answer that there is no reason why it should. The same remark applies to a case as to the right to take gravel on a common near Chislehurst, which was tried, and took more than a day. Proper provision ought to be made for trying these cases in the county where they arise, and it is idle to talk of "waste of judicial strength" in making the necessary arrangements. It happened that the criminal business at Maidstone last week was light, and indeed for several years past this county has shown a tendency to become what the *Times* calls "a small circuit." But, even with this relief there was a week's work at Maidstone on business legitimately belonging to the county. It has been suggested that a further relief might be obtained by enlarging the criminal jurisdiction of Courts of Quarter Sessions, but there are many advantages in keeping matters as they are, while the only thing to be set on the other side is the possibility of saving to the country some fraction of a judge's salary. The *Times* seems to apprehend that a further increase of the number of judges would diminish the dignity of the Bench. If, however, the best men be employed to work an improved system, we do not think the Bench will fall in public estimation. The mere statement that Assizes have been held at Guildford for six hundred years, and that almost all the magistrates assembled to meet the judges at that town are opposed to the abolition of these Assizes, ought to have weight. We believe that the majority of persons well acquainted with the Assize system are opposed to its abolition, although they think that it might be considerably improved. The pursuit of centralization and uniformity may easily lead to serious, although not immediately apparent, evils. To save a day's time of a judge is not the highest object of reform in a judicial system. But in contending for the maintenance of the ancient system of holding Assizes in every county, we do not assert that causes properly belonging to London should be tried in Surrey. On the contrary, we assert that it would be in harmony with the spirit of our law to make further and better provision for trying them in London.

THE COMMITTEE ON EXPLOSIVES.

WE called attention not long ago to a Blue Book containing some Reports from the Government Inspector of Gunpowder Works, in which the defects of the present law relating to explosives were set forth, and the necessity for its early and comprehensive amendment was strongly insisted upon. The conclusions suggested in those Reports have now received authoritative confirmation from the Parliamentary Committee which Mr. Cross promptly appointed on his accession to office to inquire into the whole subject of explosives. People who, after the first shock of alarm which that Blue Book was calculated to produce, were comfortably disposing themselves to the belief that perhaps after all things were not not quite so bad as would appear from Major Majendie's Reports, that his very alarming account of the defective condition of the law and the lax practices of the manufacturers and dealers in explosives, and his profoundly uncomfortable statement of the risks to which the public and the workpeople are daily exposed from explosions, was essentially an inspectorial view of the case, based upon an exceptionally close, not to say pedantic, brooding upon all the minute misdoing and carelessness of the trade—those who, arguing thus, believed that, when submitted to the solvent of practical inquiry, this alarmist view would be found to lose much of its sting and force, will be compelled to admit that the very useful Report of Sir John Hay's Committee leaves no room for such contented acquiescence in the continuance of the present state of things, and that the anxiety of the Government Inspector, and his urgent representation as to the necessity for fresh legislation, were fully justified.

The Report of the Committee, though couched in temperate terms and framed with an evident regard for the feelings and interests of the trade, does in fact furnish most emphatic testimony to the thoroughly unsatisfactory state of the law relating to explosives, and to the extent of the danger to

which the public is in consequence exposed. The Acts of Parliament relating to explosive substances (under which term the Committee include only explosives proper, such as gunpowder, gun-cotton, dynamite, fulminates, and applied forms of these substances in the shape of ammunition, percussion-caps, and fireworks) "do not, in the opinion of the Committee, make adequate provision for the manufacture, storage, and transport of many of the explosives to which their attention has been directed, nor for the safety of the public, or of the persons employed in the making, keeping, carriage, and importation of those explosives, while some of them impose in some respects unnecessary restrictions." The public will be interested to hear with regard to many of the large gunpowder store magazines, that while "the safety of the public is not sufficiently provided for by adequate isolation of the magazines with reference to the quantities which they contain," "the precautions taken by the storekeepers of these magazines in the very large majority of cases are not of the character which are shown to be necessary to ensure safety." It is scarcely more satisfactory to be assured that "the very greatest carelessness prevails in the management of" the various mine magazines throughout the kingdom; while as for the retail stores, which, as they are almost invariably established in towns and populous places, are of course very closely connected with the public safety, the Committee practically give them up in despair, merely observing that "as this trade may be carried on without a licence or registration, there is really no supervision with regard to the place or mode of storage, or as to the persons by whom such retail trade may be carried on." This being the state of things with regard to the storage of gunpowder, we turn with some anxiety to the paragraphs which deal with its transport, shipment, &c., and our anxiety is not allayed by the statement that "no adequate provision is made for the public safety as to the proper package or mode of conveyance for explosives when transported from one place to another, or for forbidding the transport, the loading and unloading of dangerously large quantities, through cities and populous places." Further, the present law "does not in any way regulate the importation or exportation of gunpowder." Indeed it is difficult to see how the Committee could do otherwise than report strongly on this point, in view of some evidence which was given by the Government Inspector as to the carriage of gunpowder through London, from which it appears to be the practice to convey at one time as much as fifteen or twenty tons of gunpowder through the heart of London in open carts, and during last year over one hundred tons were stated to have been conveyed in this way from Camden Town to Blackwall Stairs, and then shipped into barges with the minimum of precautions and under no sort of supervision. Each of these consignments represents nearly one-third of what exploded at Erith in 1864, and when the consequences of that explosion are borne in mind, as well as the effects which were produced a few years later in the crowded neighbourhood of Clerkenwell Prison by the explosion of a single barrel of gunpowder, the danger to which London is exposed by the careless carriage through it of immense quantities of powder can hardly be exaggerated.

In regard to what the Committee call "nitro-explosives"—a class which includes gun-cotton and dynamite—the Committee report simply but significantly that, except as to nitro-glycerine preparations, which are regulated by a special Act, "there is no adequate legal provision for regulating the manufacture, storage, transport, importation, or shipment of explosives of this class." They report further that "the law relating to the chlorate and fulminate class appears to be insufficient for the public safety." A similar remark applies to the ammunition and firework classes. At the same time, the law as to nitro-glycerine preparations, ammunition, and fireworks is pronounced "unnecessarily restrictive" and "inconvenient" to the persons engaged in those trades. The Committee, in short, condemn the existing law relating to explosives all round, and brand it as defective in two opposite directions. In the one direction it is often unduly restrictive; in the other it is unduly lax and imperfect. A law which thus inconveniences and oppresses the trader, and which imposes invidious and unnecessary restrictions upon particular explosives, while it fails to make adequate provision for the safety of the public or of the persons employed in the trade, is clearly about as bad a law as could well be conceived; and it was inevitable that when the Committee had reached this conclusion they should report "that further legislation is urgently required," to which they very properly append a recommendation that in such further legislation due regard should be had to the necessities of the trade.

The scope and character of the legislation which the Committee think necessary is indicated in the second part of the Report. Their scheme includes the repeal of all the existing Acts relating to explosives, and the substitution of a single comprehensive Act, with power to Her Majesty in Council to extend the Act from time to time to any explosive not specifically named therein. All manufacture and storage of explosives is to be carried on under licence. Of these there will be two classes, "common" and "special" licences. "Common" licences will be obtained as a matter of right on application to the urban sanitary authority or Petty Sessions. The conditions will be fixed by statute, and alterable only by Order in Council. There will be several sorts of "common" licences:—a "common house" licence for retailers and gunmakers, which will authorize the storage "up to, say, 300 lbs. of gunpowder, or 1,500 lbs. if in cartridges, and proportionate amounts of fireworks, according to the conditions of storage";

a "common magazine" licence for consumers, such as mine-owners, authorizing the storage up to about two tons of gunpowder, or one ton of gun-cotton or dynamite; a "common" manufacturing licence, for firework-makers on a small scale. Other manufacturers and importers, and persons desiring to store on a larger scale, or on conditions other than those attached to "common" licences, will have to take out "special" licences. The conditions of these are not to be enacted by statute, it being in every case left to the discretion of the licensing authorities what limits of distance and quantities and other conditions shall be introduced into the licence. To enable the licensing authorities (who, for special licences, will be Quarter Sessions in counties and Town Councils in boroughs) to do this effectively, and to ensure sufficient uniformity without centralizing the licensing work in the hands of the Home Secretary, it is provided that in all cases the special licences shall be granted upon the report of an Inspector, whose experience and technical knowledge will enable him to recommend what conditions and limits should be introduced into the licence; and this power will be guarded by a right of appeal on behalf of the applicant to the Home Secretary. By this means the inconveniences of a hard and fast line of statutory detail will be avoided, while it is probable that the prejudices and caprices of the local authorities, which appear likely to operate as much to the disadvantage of an applicant for a licence as their occasional carelessness and technical ignorance is apt in other instances to operate to the disadvantage of the public, will be held in moderate control, full scope being at the same time left for the expression of any reasonable local feeling with regard to the establishment of any proposed factory or magazine. It is recommended by the Committee that, where a magazine is destroyed by an explosion, the licence shall be considered temporary, until an inquiry has been held as to the cause of such explosion, the object being, we presume, that where the accident is traceable to the carelessness of the licensee the licence should be forfeited, as in such case would be clearly proper. In the case of the working buildings of factories where two or more are destroyed by an explosion, the written consent of the Home Secretary is to be given before re-erection; but there is a saving in favour of the buildings of existing factories, which are not to be subject to the operation of this provision except when they have previously been proscribed by an Inspector and pronounced to be in dangerous proximity. The transport and shipment of explosives are to be brought under certain bylaws, and large powers are vested in harbour authorities for making those bylaws, which in each case will be framed with regard to local requirements and afterwards reviewed and approved by the Home Secretary. These regulations, supplemented by statutory general rules as to transport, will enable the dangerous conveyance of explosives through populous places and the careless shipment or unshipment of the same in crowded harbours to be controlled. We are glad to see that the Committee propose to extend a system already in vogue in Scotland by encouraging the provision of public magazines so as to reduce the quantities stored by retailers, and they recommend that power should be given to local authorities to provide such magazines.

The Committee recommend that the Inspector's powers should be considerably enlarged. In addition to making use of him to report on applications for special licences, it is proposed that he should have powers similar to those conferred on Mine Inspectors, of requiring any dangerous practice or thing which he may observe to be remedied subject to an appeal to arbitration; but the Committee go further than this, for they recommend that in certain exceptional cases, where the matter is very urgent, and where it is also clearly contrary to the usage of the trade, the Inspector should have power to abate the evil at once, by requiring it to be "remedied forthwith," without appeal, except to the County Court for damages, when it is thought that the Inspector has acted arbitrarily. This is an extreme power, but as recommended by the Committee it is one which can only be exercised in very extreme cases, and it is so guarded and fenced round by limiting words that it is difficult to see how it can be abused even by the most capricious of Inspectors. The Committee evidently consider that the case of some very dangerous practices which may lead to an explosion involving fatal consequences is one which, like the case of an animal in the public streets discovered to be afflicted with the cattle-plague, calls for a power of prompt interference, and the public will probably share this view. This recognition of the necessity for some power of immediate interference in cases of imminent public danger constitutes an important and distinctive feature of the legislation which the Committee have sketched out; and we find this principle underlying another proposition, to the effect that in certain urgent cases the operation of the ordinary search-warrant may be superseded or supplemented by a written order given by an Inspector, or by the chief officer of police of the district, or in his absence by "any officer of police not lower than a superintendent." A person thus "specially authorized" is to have powers similar to those which in ordinary cases would be obtained by search-warrant—that is to say, a power of immediate inspection and seizure. This is a most important provision, and its application may serve to prevent the illegal storage of explosives and the illegal manufacture of fire-works in dwelling-houses at present carried on to a most alarming extent, and among the numerous fatal accidents due to which may be named the terrible disaster in Lambeth last November, and the scarcely less fatal disaster in Northampton the other day.

There are provisions in the proposed scheme for arbitration, for

special inquiries to be held by the Inspector, for notices of accidents and inquests to be sent to the Home Secretary, and for appeals. Careful attention is properly paid to "vested interests," which are specially guarded and provided for. It is proposed that all factories and magazines which can satisfy the Home Secretary that they have a lawful existence shall receive, as a matter of right, a "continuing certificate" of unlimited duration, "except to such extent as the duration may be actually limited by any existing licence affecting the factory or magazine;" and in granting this certificate the Home Secretary may impose such conditions and fix such limits as to quantities as the local authorities may do in the case of new licences, provided that no conditions may be imposed "which would have the effect of requiring the removal of any legally existing work or building, or to diminish the quantities below what the licensee is at present entitled to have." It will be open to the Home Secretary to raise the limit, but not to lower it; and thus, while the owners of existing factories are secured against being by any possibility placed in a worse position in this respect than they are in at present, they may find themselves in a better position. It appears to us that the owners of existing factories and magazines will have no cause of complaint if these recommendations are carried out. It is probably inevitable that a new Act, designed to relieve the public and the workpeople of some of the dangers to which they are at present exposed, should contain some provisions not altogether agreeable to the trade; but this scheme appears calculated to afford the requisite degree of increased public security—and certainly not more than the public have a right to demand—with the minimum disturbance of, or interference with, vested interests of trade. These temperate and judicious recommendations contrast very remarkably with the unduly stringent Nitro-Glycerine Act, which it is now proposed to repeal; and the contrast is significant, as indicating the consequences of deferring legislation until some stupendous explosion or a series of minor disasters have produced a panic. It was under the latter conditions that the Nitro-Glycerine Act of 1869 was passed; it was under similar conditions that the vexatiously restrictive and yet extremely defective clauses of the Gunpowder Act of 1860, relating to ammunition and fireworks, were framed. It is to be hoped that the forthcoming Explosives Bill may be passed before the defects of the existing law lead to a condition of things unfavourable to temperate legislation. If in the interests of the public new legislation on this subject is now "urgently required," it is certainly no less in the interests of the trade that that legislation should be accomplished during a period of comparative calm, and not deferred until some new Erith or Stowmarket or Witton explosion, or even greater catastrophe, impels Parliament to hurried and panic-stricken action. On such occasions the legislation is apt, like the subject with which it deals, to assume a very violent character.

REVIEWS.

THE COUNT OF PARIS'S HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN WAR.*

IT may seem at first sight to need some excuse that the Count of Paris has devoted the bulk of the first of his large volumes to purely introductory matter, and that chiefly of a military character. But in fact the work thus done forms its own sufficient apology. No writer of any country had before attempted to present in a complete form the facts thus gathered together; and yet, without a thorough study of the peculiar conditions under which this great war was to be carried on, criticism of its events would be almost thrown away. The saying commonly attributed to Count Moltke, that to an educated soldier the operations of 1861-65 were only "the scramblings of armed mobs," whether truly reported, or invented for the great German strategist, is a very just expression of the hopelessness of attempting to apply exact rules drawn from the practices and conduct of the standing armies of Europe to those of the improvised forces of free citizens which for four years struggled for the preservation or destruction of the American Union. Nor have any of those who claim to be standard writers on the war helped us here. Those best known and most read in America—Dr. Draper, for instance—are diffuse enough indeed in their introductory chapters. But they give their strength entirely to tracing the supposed political causes of the conflict to their roots. Party spirit on the subject of the negro, we may observe, is still so active in America, notwithstanding his emancipation, that readers there never seem to be tired of the productions of those who undertake to prove or illustrate the direct connexion of the war with the Abolition movement. That in its issue it became identical with Abolition seems to be taken for irrefragable evidence that in its beginning it was not less so. And no American writer of weight has as yet undertaken to go deeper into the springs of this dreadful contest, and to show how far the uncertain condition in which the founders of the great Republic, in order to make their own task the smoother, left their prime difficulty of the bounds between Federal and State rights is responsible for what ensued. Nor has any one sought to discover whether the question of slavery or no-slavery was really the essential cause which brought about disunion, or merely the immediate occasion that produced a collision which the elements

* *Histoire de la guerre civile en Amérique.* Par M. le Comte de Paris, ancien aide-de-camp du général MacClellan. Tome 1. Paris: Lévy. 1874.

of an ill-defined Constitution had made certain to occur at some time or other.

To analyse the political bearings of the conflict in an impartial spirit would not be a popular work in America, so one-sided is the view still taken there of the great crisis in the Republic's history. And yet the parallel case of Switzerland, where a secession was put down by force of arms but a few years earlier, should shake the dogmatic belief of Union writers that nothing but slavery could possibly have been answerable for what they now speak of as the greatest of civil crimes. Such a historian as Bancroft or Motley may possibly hereafter undertake the work in a more philosophic spirit, and we may not unreasonably hope for this service from one or other of those eminent authors since both are now free from diplomatic toils. But whoever is to succeed in it must go much further back in American history than has hitherto been attempted, and must trace the connexion between the looseness of the original framework of the united colonies and the rude shock which threatened their disruption. Nay, he must seek in their earlier condition as dependencies the germs of those peculiarities which made the Down-Easter a distinct type of man from the Carolina planter, and the Kentuckian different from either.

The service here indicated for the future historian of American polity is done for American armies by the Count of Paris. In the introductory chapters he not only describes the contending forces with the power of a military critic who adds practical knowledge of the subject which he treats to a theorist's breadth of view, but he also takes notice of their descent from the colonial levies which fought with varying success under the British standard in our contests with the French for trans-Atlantic supremacy; the modification of the American soldiery under the wise and steadfast guidance of Washington in the War of Independence; the local causes which stamped their respective peculiarities on the armies of the Union and Confederacy—all these points are clearly traced out in the introductory chapters in a way that has never been done before. Nor does the Count omit to examine with equal care the peculiar conditions of the land, and of the communications through it, which so largely influenced the course of the struggle. Here, however, other European writers may have been beforehand with him; but he has no rival to fear in his review of the living masses who sprang, as it were, ready armed from the homesteads of the North and the plantations of the South, and whose very numbers, so suddenly raised, so spontaneously recruited, have made them a mystery to foreign critics. Some of the lighter-minded of these have been content to meet the problem which they could not solve by declaring the whole story to be surrounded with myths begotten of the fertile Yankee invention. To hardly any does it seem to have occurred that colonists, though ordinarily wrapt in peaceful pursuits, have a readiness for self-defence born of the very nature of those pursuits, and that the freedom and activity of municipal institutions in America had infused throughout the people of the States of the Union an earnestness in political matters that was sure to tell powerfully in war, which is after all but the rudest and most violent form of political contest. Probably no one who had not at least been in some new country peopled by men of English blood, where life is more active, property more rapidly accumulated, the race better supplied with all material necessities than with us, would be qualified for writing critically on the American war. Certainly no one whose mind had not been carefully trained beforehand could have generalized from the results of brief and partial observation, such as was open to the Count during his short service with Mac-Clellan, with the skill and power displayed in this volume.

To show that this praise is not too high, we turn to the work itself, and purposely take a passage at random from the chapter headed *Les Volontaires Fédéraux*, which describes the various arms of the Northern forces, and their characteristics. We fall at once upon an account of the cavalry, and read as follows:—

The mounted volunteers naturally took the regular cavalry as their model, and imitated their mode of fighting, which, as has been said before, approached that of the old dragoon of the seventeenth century, thus bringing about a curious similarity between the old military customs of Europe and those of modern America. But if these horsemen borrowed the carbine of the regulars, it was not because they had to do with a foe as nimble as the Indians, but rather because all inexperienced soldiers when they have to choose between cold steel and firearms, prefer the latter, as not compelling them to close with the adversary. Besides, to handle a lance or sabre, a rider must know how to manage his horse properly, and the horsemanship of these volunteers was wretched at the beginning of the war. They did not fire from the saddle like those of the time of Louis XIV., but fell into a habit of fighting on foot, leaving every fourth man to look after the horses. The broken and wooded nature of the ground was favourable to this, and indeed it would not have permitted the grand and rapid movements of cavalry accustomed to depend upon the fury of their charge, had any such existed in America. For the rest, at the beginning of the conflict, the cavalry kept to the troublesome task of feeling the way for the army, and skirmishing at the advanced posts. Difficult as this must be for raw troops, the service was not entirely new to these American cavaliers, accustomed as they had been to an adventurous life, which suited their spirit of individual enterprise. If they had not always the true instinct for war, nor that constant vigilance which is indispensable when in the presence of the enemy, their address and boldness atoned for these defects; and a thousand petty skirmishes which can find no place in our narrative gave them occasion to show that inventiveness of spirit which is never lacking in the American when some stratagem has to be devised or some bold stroke accomplished. At a later period the importance of cavalry developed itself, as to them fell the new branch of war known as "raids" or grand independent expeditions, such as we shall have to speak of hereafter.

To which we may add, as a striking proof of the growth of this arm and its operations as the war waxed old, that the last important

body of troops organized by the North was a complete army corps of these mounted soldiers, which advanced into the heart of the hitherto untouched portion of the Seceded States under Wilson, previously one of Sheridan's division generals, and completed the conquest of the district between Atlanta and the Mississippi which Sherman had passed by in his march on Savannah. No one in Europe had imagined that America could find horses, to say nothing of riders, for such vast operations. We only very recently learnt from the mouth of one of the chief Union cavalry commanders that calculations were made showing that the most liberal waste of horseflesh that could be allowed for would not have exhausted the resources of the North in efficient animals for full three years more.

The passage of the Count's work already quoted proves sufficiently the keenness of his observation; but the strength of this volume, as before noted, lies above all in his just appreciation of the historic causes out of which grew the peculiarities of the American armies. It is difficult within our limits to do justice to his treatment of this hitherto virgin subject; but we will select one special passage to show how skilfully the distinguished author connects his own country's fame with the origin of the really high qualities which the soldiers of the Civil War displayed.

It was against our own soldiers [he writes] in the Seven Years' War that the American volunteers, in those days the provincial militia of a British colony, made their first essay in arms. We may remark this, not only without any bitterness, for the flag of the United States since it first waved has never been found arrayed on the battle-field against that of France, but even as a souvenir that makes one bond the more between them and ourselves. During the unequal contest which decided the possession of the New World, these militia received useful lessons in measuring their strength with the handful of heroic men who defended our Empire beyond the seas when abandoned by their country. The soldiers of the War of Independence were formed in this school. Montcalm rather than Wolfe was the instructor of these adversaries on whom so soon fell the task of avenging him. It was in seeking, by long and often disastrous expeditions, to be beforehand with the French power on the banks of the Ohio, that the founder of American nationality served an apprenticeship in that indefatigable energy which brought him triumphant over every obstacle. It was the example of the defenders of Fort Carillon, checking an English army from behind their wretched parapet, which in later years inspired those who fought at Bunker's Hill. It was the surrender of Washington at Fort Mifflin, the disaster of Braddock before Fort Duquesne, which taught the victors of Saratoga how, in these uncultivated countries, to embarrass an enemy's march, cut off his supplies, nullify his apparent superiority, and end by finally taking or destroying his force. Thus, though they were at first despised by the aristocratic ranks of the regular English army, these Provincial Militia, as they then were called, managed soon to win the esteem as well as the respect of their foe. In this war, so perfectly different from the wars of Europe, in these actions fought in the midst of a wooded and savage country, they already developed all those qualities which have since distinguished the American—address, energy, courage, and individual intelligence.

Even those who may differ from the Comte de Paris in his high estimate of the effect produced on American soldiers by the early contest with those of France, will not deny the justice with which he brings out the peculiar features of their character as warriors, nor the skill with which he connects these circumstances with the history of the early settlements of his own countrymen in that continent where Frenchmen have long since ceased to hold a foot of ground. Could we follow him further here, we should find his sketch of the War of Independence, and of the influence it exercised in moulding the events of the Civil War, not a whit less interesting. And, as the reader may naturally expect, this part of American history is not passed over without a reference to the services rendered to the raw American troops by the experience of Lafayette's French contingent. It is fair to add that no excessive weight is attached by the author to this alliance with France, and that he gives the chief honours of the success where they properly belong, to the indomitable energy of Washington. We would willingly have dwelt more on certain episodes of that struggle, which is here touched on with admirable clearness. One of them, the mutiny of the Pennsylvania troops at the close of their three years' service, on the pretext of a grammatical construction of the terms of their engagement contrary to that assigned them by Congress, and the too easy yielding of the latter to their pretensions, is most justly commented on as "giving a deep and lasting blow to the discipline" of American volunteers. It served in fact as an evil precedent for the armies of McDowell and Mac-Clellan. And this is but one of many examples of the research and knowledge of the author, of whose introductory chapters we can but repeat that, though intended in the first place for French readers, they offer such a contribution to the study of American military history as soldiers of every country, and Americans themselves above all, have reason to be sincerely grateful for.

(To be continued.)

BURROWS'S WORTHIES OF ALL SOULS.*

THE work of the Chichele Professor of Modern History would be easier to review if it were either better or worse. There is nothing about the book to make us fall into superlatives, nothing that lends to an *-issimus* one way or another. There is nothing bad about it; there are no bad mistakes, no extravagances of style or sentiment. It is simply weak. And when we say that it is weak, we say so simply by comparison. If it were the work of an ordinary local antiquary searching out the annals of his own Little

* *Worthies of All Souls; Four Centuries of English History Illustrated from the College Archives.* By Montagu Burrows. London: Macmillan & Co. 1874.

Peddlington, we should welcome it as unusually strong. But from an Oxford Professor, the first Professor on a new foundation, we certainly have a right to look for something stronger. If the author were Warden of All Souls instead of Fellow, we should hail the book as a great step in the direction of culture. For we gather from the book itself that, up to this time, the greatest literary achievement of any Warden of All Souls has been a translation of Cornelius Nepos. Now to translate Cornelius Nepos is clearly a lesser achievement than to be oneself the Cornelius Nepos of the College. From a purely All Souls point of view, Professor Burrows has certainly established a better claim to be set down on his own list of worthies than many of those of whom he writes. But when we look out into the world at large, into the University at large, our standard rises a little. By the Commissioners' scheme of reform All Souls was to be made a great school of history. Five fellowships, the maintenance of five possible worthies, were rolled together to make the maintenance of one greater worthy in the form of the Chichele Professor of Modern History. One might perhaps have expected that ten years of learning and teaching under such advantages as these might have produced something more than what we have before us. But we will not repine. It might easily have been less; it might easily have been something on the other side. There have been Regius Professors elsewhere, past and present, who make us not at all inclined to complain of our living fivefold worthy. If the food which he gives us is not specially nourishing, it is still food and not poison. And perhaps it is well that everything should come in its due order. The pile on our table which awaits judgment reminds us that the Chichele Professor is not the only representative of history in Oxford. It may be well to use the milk of All Souls as a preparation before we strive to digest the strong meat which has been fed on the successive pastures of Christ Church, Trinity, and Oriel.

The history of a college must always be a somewhat difficult subject to handle, and it would need a good deal of skill to bring forth prominently any special points in its constitution and history which distinguishes it from other foundations of the same class. There is also the difficulty that no one except a member of the college is likely either to know enough or to care enough about the matter to deal with it at all, while with a member of the college there is always a fear that his own interest in the subject may lead him to dwell too fully on matters which are not interesting or even intelligible to outsiders. Some colleges can hardly be said to have any history except in the sense of mere annals, mere *fasti* of their members. Others have a special interest from the nature of their foundations, or from some particular points in their history. Thus Merton, as the beginning of the collegiate system in Oxford, and as surpassing almost every other college in the interest of its buildings, would be a specially promising subject for the collegiate historian. St. John's, Cambridge, on the other hand, which has been singularly lucky in its historians both in earlier and in later times, also presents the twofold interest of the remarkable way in which it grew out of a series of earlier foundations, and of its long lists of eminent men in later times. All Souls too has its advantages; at any rate the subject is not commonplace, as All Souls has always been so singularly unlike other colleges. It is one of a group, the second of five, four in Oxford and one in Cambridge. This is the group which followed the lead of William of Wykeham in the foundation of New College, with its feeder at Winchester. King's College at Cambridge, with its feeder at Eton, is an exact copy. All Souls, Magdalen, and St. John's at Oxford, and we may perhaps add Corpus, follow the same type somewhat less closely, and they have been perhaps not without influence on most later foundations. The colleges which we have named all agree in being the creations of individual founders, as opposed to those both earlier and later which have grown up bit by bit. They all have an unusual number of members on the foundation, and, with the exception of St. John's, they were all remarkable till very late times for having singularly few members not on the foundation. In the matter of building also New College started a type of chapel which was reproduced at All Souls and at Magdalen, and which has had an influence at Wadham, and at the Cambridge St. John's in our own day. But Archbishop Chichele, though he had New College before his eye, departed from the precedent of his own founder in several points. New College was eminently designed as an educational foundation, though the particular scheme chosen by the founder, that of choosing his scholars from a particular school, and making them become Fellows at a certain standing, pretty much as a matter of course, was found not to answer in later times. But it must be remembered that the failure of William of Wykeham's plan is one of those cases where a rule which had one effect when it was first laid down comes in process of time to have an exactly opposite effect. When William of Wykeham decreed that all his scholars should pass through his school at Winchester, it was the same thing as to say that they should all have the best preliminary education that was then to be had. When a crowd of other schools equally good with Winchester had arisen, the same rule simply had the effect of narrowing the choice of the electors. Chichele's plan differed from that of Wykeham in that the foundation consisted wholly of Fellows, whom we conceive to have been always necessarily graduates, or at all events not absolutely fresh from school. We speak thus doubtfully because Professor Burrows does not go so largely as we could wish into this comparison of constitutions in other colleges. So we do not know for certain whether an actual degree has always been

necessary; but at any rate All Souls has always been distinguished for the absence of undergraduates either on or off the foundation. At one time it seems to have had a large staff of servitors, but it never had anybody answering to either the scholars or commoners of other colleges, and of late besides the Fellows there have only been a few chaplains and clerks for the service of the chapel. All Souls in fact, with no scholars, no commoners, with its Fellows mainly non-resident almost from the beginning, has had absolutely no share in the teaching work of the University, except so far as it has either sent forth, or in later times received, Professors. Owing again to the lack of undergraduate members, it follows that every Fellow of All Souls has come from some other college, supplying in this a marked contrast to New College, Magdalen, and St. John's. Such a college, founded on so magnificent a scale, and not hampered by the same restrictions as most others, ought to have been one of the greatest seats of learning in the University. And of course no one will think of denying that the Professor's roll-call of Worthies of All Souls does contain a large number of men of real eminence. Still the number, in proportion to the greatness of the foundation, is certainly not what might have been expected, nor what has often been the case in many much smaller foundations. And the eminent men whom All Souls has turned out have for the most part been eminent in some way not directly academical. Professor Burrows clearly feels this. He clearly feels the extraordinary obscurity of the successive Wardens. He honestly records the corrupt practice of selling resignations which prevailed in the seventeenth century, and against which successive Wardens and Visitors had to struggle; nor does he attempt to deny that, even when these corrupt practices were got rid of, All Souls, as a rule, did not shine. "It cannot be said that the modes of election described in the last chapter produced many men of genius or great distinction," though he adds fairly enough, "It is only fair to remember that the age itself was not fertile in such till towards the close of the last century, nor have other colleges very much to boast of during the last century." Presently he says:—

Without educational duties on the one hand, and without on the other producing a crop of men of high distinction who might justify the use made of the Founder's bounty, it was natural that it should come to be regarded from without as a mere Club, open to envy and detraction by the fact of its exclusiveness. Thus whatever ground it afforded for these attacks, it did not obtain even its fair share of credit for such good work as it did in a quiet and unobtrusive way, for the excellent members of Parliament, county magistrates, clergy, Public Servants, and lawyers it sent forth, or for the high standard of social cultivation and good manners which it presented during an age of coarse and boisterous habits not very far removed from those of the previous century, while they were less relieved by wit and brilliancy.

The Professor then goes on to refute the popular saying about "*bene nati, bene vestiti, et mediocriter docti*," and then goes on to say:—

Whether the prevalence of this witticism did really exercise in any degree the influence of the old proverb, and the College, seeing it had obtained a bad name in this respect, grew to be careless as to examinations during the last half of the last century and beginning of the present, can only be matter of conjecture; but, certainly, several years before the Commission of 1852, any men of literary merit or promise were elected, and the writer has been informed on the best living authority that no instance is known of any candidate being rejected who had obtained a First Class in the Public Examinations of the University.

It does not seem to have struck either the Professor or the best living authority that, if no first-classman was ever rejected, it follows that it never happened that two first-classmen went in for the same fellowship. This fact, which oozes out in this incidental way, throws a good deal of light on All Souls' elections. It is quite possible that electors may really try to regard merit, as far as they know how, and yet, having been elected on a vicious system, they may not know, if left to themselves, how to tell a better candidate from a worse. And when a college has once got a reputation for choosing only men of a particular class, whether men of family or its own members, or any other class, it finds it very hard to get out of the groove, because men of other classes will not come in. At the same time, it would seem that no one could be better off than the first-classman who went in at All Souls, if only he could be sure that no other first-classman was going in to.

Of the way in which the Professor has gone through his not very exciting task there is really not much to say. The worst that could be said is that a stronger hand would have done it better; and with regard to the internal history of the college it is of course impossible for those who have not the college archives before them to put his narrative to any minute test. The part where the history of All Souls becomes most instructive is in the latter half of the seventeenth century, when a great fight had to be fought against the custom of the Crown and men in power interfering with freedom of election to wardenships and fellowships. This is a subject on which we have often spoken, and it is one which it is specially necessary always to bear in mind when dealing either with the doings of James the Second or with the practice which became law in the case of bishoprics, and a custom almost of the force of law in the case of old-foundation deaneries. Take, for instance, the way in which Charles the Second, in 1670, forced a certain Peter Prideaux into a fellowship. The King "wills and requires" the College to elect him, "any canon, statue, custom, or constitution of the College notwithstanding," all of which he "graciously dispenses with." A second letter announces the King's pleasure that Prideaux be admitted "without difficulty or delay":—

Then follows in April a third letter, in which the King is still more astonished that "the Fellows forget the duty they owe to us."

"We can by no means allow of this contempt for our authority in interpositions of this kind. . . . We are offended at the undutiful proceedings of the Fellows in this matter, especially of such of them as having been intruders with notorious violence and injustice into the places of honest and loyal persons during the late usurpations, forget with how little right they live there to oppose our letters.

Prideaux was elected, but it seems that the King afterwards mended his ways. James the Second however again forced on the college as Warden one Finch, a son of the Earl of Winchelsea, who, as being a Fellow, and not being a Papist, was at least not statutorily disqualified, but whom the Professor not unjustly has spoken of a little before as "a disreputable youth." The College submitted because they feared that if they refused to elect him they might have a Papist forced upon them. This *pseudo*- or *pretensio* *custos* lived to be most righteously bearded by a chaplain of the College, to have a "forced limitation" of his battells till his debts to the College were paid, but also to write a life of Hannibal and to translate Cornelius Nepos. This last was at any rate more than was done by those Wardens of the next century of whom all that Professor Burrows can find to say is that they "were eminently calculated to preserve the College in a state of tranquillity." We do not know whether this is meant for satire, for the formula is presently changed for "successfully."

Throughout the whole story Professor Burrows keeps on a style of praiseworthy impartiality between contending parties. It is not merely that he draws a very narrow line, so that Abbot does not wholly please him on one side nor Laud on the other, for he shows real fairness when he allows merit in some of those who were thrust in by the Parliamentary Commissioners. Charles the First is a martyr, but the Professor by no means approves of all his doings. Where he gets most animated is in trying to make out a case for Sheldon. Throughout the book there is a quiet and decorous tone, congenial perhaps to the atmosphere of a spot where so many Wardens ruled in tranquillity. The Professor's gentle flow is only mildly broken by a special love of notes of admiration which commonly mark sentences containing undeniable truths which begin with the formula "how much" or "how many," though we are bound to say that the Professor once warms to a note of admiration on the subject of the famous College Mallard. It is not very often that the Professor indulges in metaphor or simile, which perhaps makes the following little parable the more precious. The fashion of princes and others interfering with elections had begun early. One case of this kind is to be found in a letter said to be "the only letter or paper written in English known to have emanated from one of the most interesting young princes our country has possessed, Arthur Prince of Wales, son of Henry the Seventh, the first husband of Katharine of Aragon!" A generation later Edward the Sixth wants to get a lease of some college lands for his physician, on which the Professor thus comments:—

The letter reminds us of the former one written by Edward's uncle, Prince Arthur. All Souls seems to have been a practising ground for the Tudor boy-princes, not unlike the little cork on which the playful kitten exercises its nascent powers before it breaks ground on rats and mice. Perhaps when other Colleges contribute their history we shall find that All Souls was not without companions.

It was our good luck to read this passage on the very day on which the papers contained the history of the cat which burst into the House of Commons and practised its nascent powers, not on any mere cork, but on no less a person than Mr. Gathorne Hardy. What became of the intruder in that case is not recorded, but considering the short lives of the Tudor boy-princes in the Professor's parable, we cannot conceive that so daring an animal could be fated to any great length of days. Imagination fails us in trying to conceive the "majores"—one would rather say "maximi"—"mures qui vulgariter vocantur rati," on which its full-grown powers may have in the end, in the Professor's phrase, to "break ground."

SMITH'S MOHAMMED AND MOHAMMEDANISM.*

IT is not a little singular, when we consider not only the intrinsic interest of the subject, but that special importance which our connexion with the East might be supposed to give it in the eyes of Englishmen, that we should have so few books dealing with Islam and its origin. Gibbon of course is admirable, and Ockley's *History of the Saracens* was lively, if not always trustworthy; but, although a great deal has been done since their time in the way of research, we have hardly any full and thorough modern account of the Prophet's life except Sir William Muir's; and of the subsequent history and present aspects of Mohammedanism we have no comprehensive narrative or description, only stray articles and short treatises dealing with particular departments of the subject. And though Germany and France have both done much, more perhaps than we have done, they have by no means exhausted the theme. In one sense indeed it is inexhaustible. For Mohammedanism is always changing, and the character of its founder is so extraordinary, so full of apparent contradictions, that it admits of being represented in an infinite variety of lights, and receiving endless fresh illustrations from new quarters. We are therefore disposed to welcome any new labourer in this field, even when he admits that he has no new facts drawn from original sources to lay before us. Mr. Smith does not appear to be a Semitic scholar; but he has evidently read

widely and carefully, and brings to his task not only considerable literary power, but what is less common and more valuable, an earnest interest in the subject which makes his book a fresh and pleasant one to read, and more stimulating than a laborious treatise might perhaps have been.

It consists of four lectures delivered last winter at the Royal Institution in Albemarle Street, and is therefore necessarily somewhat popular, and, so to speak, "contemporary," in manner, yet without being either sensational or flimsy. Beginning with some remarks on the science of religion in general, and the relation of such a science to Christianity (a topic which had better have been left untouched than touched in six or seven pages only), Mr. Smith proceeds to sketch the progress made by Mohammedanism since the days of its first conquests, and to show how extensive its hold upon the world now is—a fact which few Englishmen realize. So far from being confined to Western Asia and Northern Africa, it has spread over Central Tartary, and from India into the Indian Archipelago and China, while it is every day making fresh progress in Africa, is now professed up nearly the whole course of the Nile, and by various tribes from Sierra Leone to Zanzibar. He might have added that it has crossed the Atlantic with the coolies, and counts its adherents by thousands in Guiana and Trinidad. The second lecture contains an interesting account of the conditions under which Mohammed arose—the state of belief in Arabia where monotheism had not wholly yielded to fetishism and the worship of the heavenly bodies, the influences of Christian and Jewish tribes with whom the inhabitants of Mecca must frequently have come in contact, and the expectation of a prophet to arise in Arabia itself. Then we come to the life of the Prophet himself. He is a singular exception to the rule that those who achieve anything great achieve it, or at least begin to do so, in their youth:—

Up to the age of forty there is nothing to show that any serious scruple had occurred to him individually as to the worship of idols, and in particular of the Black Stone of which his family were the hereditary guardians. The sacred month of Ramadhan, like other religious Arabs, he observed with punctilious devotion; and he would often retire to the caverns of Mount Ilira for purposes of solitude, meditation, and prayer. He was melancholic in temperament, to begin with; he was also subject to epileptic fits, upon which Sprenger has laid great stress, and described most minutely, and which, whether under the name of the "sacred disease" among the Greeks, or "possession by the devil" among the Jews, have in most ages and countries been looked upon as something specially mysterious or supernatural. . . . Mohammed was of middle height, and of a strongly-built frame; his head was large, and across his ample forehead, and above finely-arching eyebrows, ran a strongly-marked vein, which, when he was angry, would turn black and throb visibly. His eyes were coal black and piercing in their brightness; his hair curled slightly; and a long beard, which, like other Orientals, he would stroke when in deep thought, added to the general impressiveness of his appearance. His step was quick and firm, like that of one descending a hill. Between his shoulders was the famous mark, the size of a pigeon's egg, which his disciples persisted in believing to be the sign of his prophetic office; while the light which kindled in his eye like that which flashed from the precious stones in the breastplate of the High Priest, they called the light of prophecy. . . . The most noteworthy of his external characteristics was a sweet gravity and a quiet dignity which drew involuntary respect, and which was the best and often the only protection he enjoyed from insult. His ordinary dress was plain even to coarseness; yet he was fastidious in arranging it to the best advantage. He was fond of ablutions; and fonder still of perfumes, and he prided himself on the neatness of his hair and the pearly whiteness of his teeth. His life was simple in all its details. He lived with his wives in a row of humble cottages, separated from one another by palm branches, cemented together with mud. He would kindle the fire, sweep the floor, and milk the goats himself. Ayesha tells us that for months together he did not get a sufficient meal. The little food that he had was always shared with those who dropped in to partake of it. Indeed, outside the Prophet's house was a bench or gallery on which were always to be found a number of the poor who lived entirely on the Prophet's generosity, and were hence called "the people of the bench."

The personal character of Mohammed is then examined, and its best points are brought into relief in a manner which is fair enough, because the author's admiration is clearly enough avowed. And even those who cannot quite share Mr. Smith's enthusiasm will admit that he makes out a better case for his Prophet than they had expected. He shows how great were the temptations he was exposed to, how much modesty and humility he preserved even in the day of triumph, how erroneous is the common idea that with him, as with so many other conquerors, success brought with it a steady moral decline. And he brings out well what commonplace observers often forget, that a certain measure of condescension, adaptation of teaching, one might almost say of self-degradation and deceit, by a prophet practised to and on his disciples, is perfectly compatible with a continued belief in the divine character of his mission. That Mohammed was sincere at starting (if a term which does not quite represent the complexity of the matter may be used), most people will now admit; that he remained sincere to the end, when the purity of his aims and life had been seriously soiled, seems a fair conclusion from the facts on which Mr. Smith dilates.

The third lecture gives an account of Islam itself, "a verbal noun derived from a root meaning 'submission to' and 'faith in God,' while the believers who so submit themselves are called Moslems, a participle of the same root, both being connected with the words 'Salam' or 'peace,' and 'Salym' or 'healthy.'" "It consists of two central truths—the unity of God, and that He is a righteous and merciful ruler, to whose will it is the duty and privilege of all men to bow." The other articles of faith which have become part of the Mohammedan system, such as the existence of angels and the Jinn, the resurrection and future life, the duties of almsgiving, fasting, and pilgrimage, are borrowed from other systems, and are not of its essence; while the veneration for Mecca and the Kaaba is a mere concession to ancient superstition,

* *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*. Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain in February and March 1874. By R. Bosworth Smith, M.A. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1874.

which had hallowed the spot and its aerolite centuries before Mohammed's time. Our author admits that to one who cannot read it in the original, as a book of poetry, the Koran is (as we confess to have found it) insufferably dull; but it contains nevertheless passages of real moral sublimity, several of which, quoted by Mr. Smith, quite deserve the honour he claims for them. And he remarks with truth, that fatalism, to most minds so closely associated with Mohammedanism, is not to be found directly taught in it, though there are isolated expressions tending that way (as there are in the Pauline Epistles); and that the duty of propagating Islam by the sword was rather forced upon the Prophet and his first successors by circumstances natural to their time, and commended to them by his rapid triumphs, than a necessary part of the faith which he originally preached, and which the Koran records. Much the same apology is made for those blemishes on which Christian critics of Mohammed have most commonly fastened—his recognition of polygamy and slavery, and the sensual character of his Paradise; the former of which Mr. Smith maintains to have been no more than an acceptance of existing institutions which could not have been changed, even by the Prophet; while, as to the latter, he insists that the figurative language of the Koran has been literalized, and its brief hints as to the nature of the future life expanded by the vulgar imagination into the picture we are now so familiar with. He then proceeds to inquire, first, why Mohammed rejected Christianity, and secondly, what is the attitude which Christians ought to take towards Islam; arguing strenuously that it ought to be regarded as an imperfect form of Christianity, a weaker sister, rather than as a rival or enemy. It is, he seems to think, possibly better adapted to the Eastern peoples, or at any rate will never be expelled by Christianity from among them; it shows a power of revival (as evidenced by the growth of Wahhabeeism) which proves it to be still full of life and force; it is perhaps the most efficient civilizing and elevating influence that can be brought to bear on such degraded races as those of the Soudan or the eastern side of Africa. All this, though urged with considerable eloquence, is anything but conclusive, for it rests upon the fallacy that the Christians of the East are inferior to the Mohammedan population of the same countries on account of their religion; whereas a simpler explanation may be found in the fact that they are a subject class, who have never, since the seventh century, had a fair chance given them, and who have been cut off from intercourse with the great Western nations. The fortunes of nations and of religions are too complex to be explained by a reference to original differences of race; to fall back on this, as Mr. Smith and so many recent writers do, is not to give, but to evade, a solution.

Nor is it true, as Mr. Smith seems to assume, that the Semitic and those whom he calls the Turanian races (though this linguistic name ought not to be so employed) are inferior to the Indo-Europeans—the West contains no more energetic races than the Turanian Magyars and Basques. The condition of Christianity in Syria or Abyssinia suggests many reflections; but the last which it need suggest is that of the superior fitness of Mohammedanism for those countries which remain unprogressive under Mohammedan sway; nor is the difficulty of explaining why Christianity has not expelled Islam from the East any greater than that of showing why Protestantism has not advanced since the sixteenth century.

Moreover, in the picture which the writer draws of the merits of Mohammed and his faith—merits which we are glad to have so clearly brought out—he passes far too lightly over many serious evils and drawbacks. Take, for instance, the position of women, which he says the Prophet was obliged to leave as he found it; is it not the gravest reproach to a religion that it should be unable to effect the moral reform which the vices of the East most called and call for? that, instead of raising woman as Christianity has done to be the equal of man, it should sanction her degradation, and sanction with it a host of hideous attendant evils, such as those to which Sir Charles Trevelyan called attention the other day? The crimes of Mohammedan slave-dealers are no worse than those of Christian slave-traders formerly; but can any one expect the modern Christian feeling on the subject to spread or to find any response in Mussulman countries?

It will be seen that we are far enough from agreeing with our author's views either as to the moral tendencies of Islam or the philosophy of religion in general; and we are sometimes provoked to see him fall into the vulgar error of regarding Christianity and what he calls Judaism as wholly different religions, different in much the same sense in which both differ from Mohammedanism. On the contrary, it is perfectly clear, whether we look at the earliest views of it as they are expressed in the New Testament, or again in the Fathers of the first centuries, or whether we examine the matter in a comprehensive historical spirit, that Christianity is and professes to be essentially a renewal or expansion and development of that religion whereof Abraham and Moses were the first prophets. This is pure matter of history, altogether apart from the claim of either to be a divine revelation. There are marks of literary inexperience in Mr. Smith's book, both in its defective arrangement, in the undue vehemence with which he sometimes expresses himself, and in his too frequent reference to and exaggerated respect for several very recent writers, whom it would be invidious to name because they are writers of real merit, only not quite such sole or commanding authorities as his language would imply. Nor is it free from historical inaccuracies, such as the reference to Charlemagne's (this is not the name whereby Mr. Smith, who follows the new fashion, calls him) defeat at Roncesvalles, which is mentioned as if inflicted by the

Spanish Arabs; or the mention of Alaric as carrying on "wars of devastation"; or the reference to the Constable Bourbon's sack of Rome as the deed of "the eldest son of the Church," a title usually given to the King of France; or the reference to the Hungarians in p. 169. These however are defects which do not make the book less readable—it is eminently readable—and scarcely detract from the praise to which it is entitled as a vigorous treatment of one of the greatest of all historical themes. Mr. Smith is not only the master of a lively and forcible style, to which our extract is far from doing justice; he shows real historical power; and he writes with a keen interest in his subject which communicates itself to the reader, throwing into his admirations and hatreds a heartiness which, if it somewhat affects our confidence in his judgment, enables him to leave a far deeper impression than a book of these modest dimensions can generally hope to produce. Our chief complaint against it is indeed that it is so short, and that a larger part of it has not been devoted to a more detailed record of Mohammed's life and words. And though we cannot accept his picture of Islam and its effects as a true one, we are glad to admit that he has shown good reason why it should expect a far more favourable judgment, and be watched and studied with a far more appreciative interest, than it has hitherto received either from Englishmen or from the Christians of the West in general.

MONTÉGUT'S BURGUNDY.*

(Second Notice.)

WHEN English travellers go from Paris to Lyons or Marseilles, they sometimes, but rarely, stay to see the cathedral at Sens, and hardly ever stay to explore Joigny, or Tonnerre, or Montbard; but they more frequently stay a night at Dijon, yet not so frequently as the famous old city deserves. One of the most curious results of the railway system is that people get such a habit of "burning" places, according to the French expression—that is, passing them without stopping. We know an English gentleman who had a house for years near a station between Fontainebleau and Joigny, and he went frequently to Paris, passing of necessity the Fontainebleau station every time; yet he never once stayed to see the palace and forest, from an absurd notion, entirely illusory, that something compelled him every time to get to the end of his little journey as fast as possible. The habit of passing places in this way—and it is a mere habit—is formed very early in the experience of a railway traveller who takes long journeys. It is evident that if a man going from Paris to the Mediterranean were to stop to spend a day in every interesting place near the railroad, he would be a month on the journey; so he takes a through ticket, gets a snug corner in the comfortable express, and is whirled past half the old cities in a doze, whilst he catches glimpses of the others in his more wakeful moments when big stations and gloomy tunnels will allow him. The capital of Burgundy happens to be just one of those places which are almost invisible from the railway. The hilly land to the north has had to be pierced with cuttings and tunnels between Plombières and Dijon, in which of course the traveller sees nothing at all, and when at last he does get to Dijon itself, he is landed in a big station, with no prospect but the very attractive one of the best dinner that is to be had at any railway station in the world. To this the wise traveller will of course pay due attention, and when the train starts again, supposing it to be daylight, he will see a spire and a tower or two if he looks out of the right window at the proper time, and will think of Dijon ever afterwards as the place where he got that good dinner.

M. Montégut naturally stayed longer in the capital of Burgundy than in any one of the minor towns. He begins by expressing his satisfaction that the good folks of Dijon have escaped the mania for erecting bronze statues of local celebrities, and supposes that one reason for this may be the remarkable number of eminent Dijonnais. The only statue they have is one of Saint-Bernard. However, they are not indifferent to the names of their celebrities, for they have had them engraved on slabs of black marble fixed on the houses where the great men lived or came into the world. M. Montégut approves of this plan quite as much as he dislikes the fashion of bronze statues, and we certainly cannot see any objection to it, though it is said to be disapproved of by the "edility" of London, if indeed there be such a thing as an edility in London. The system seems to be particularly useful for such tourists as are sufficiently intelligent and well-informed to care or know anything about the great men who have been born in the streets of towns, and it is certainly very agreeable to meet with the name of a man long known to us by his works or actions when we happen to be travelling in the country of his birth. Dijon is not only particularly rich in associations of this kind, but it has always been a remarkably lucky place. M. Montégut says that of all the old French provinces Burgundy was invariably the best governed, and that of all the Burgundian towns Dijon has been always most favoured. The place has been fortunate in escaping destructive invasions, and even during the last war, although it was occupied for a long time by the Germans, and there was a good deal of fighting in the neighbourhood, nothing occurred beyond private loss and inconvenience, and the city was not prevented from resuming its accustomed appearance of wealth and prosperity soon after the departure of the enemy. But it is especially in the early history of Dijon that its immunity from the miseries of war-time

* *Souvenirs de Bourgogne.* Par Emile Montégut. Paris: Hachette.

is conspicuous, especially if compared with the terrible annals of Autun:—

Tranquille sous les bons barbares qui donnèrent leur nom à la Bourgogne, épargnée sous les rois francs, bien défendue sous les ducs de la décadence carlovingienne, elle vécut dans une sorte de libre esclavage sous les ducs de la première race capétienne, et lorsqu'enfin l'ère des franchises communales fut arrivée, elle obtint sans coup férir, à titre de pur don princier, les libertés que les autres villes avaient eu à payer par la révolte, l'anarchie et le sang versé.

Then came a time of splendid development, especially in the days of Philippe le Hardi, who embellished the city with magnificent edifices and gave it the luxury of the fine arts. During a wretched and bloody century Dijon lived in safety and splendour and freedom, hearing of fighting at a distance, as London does now, but never experiencing its miseries. Even when Charles the Bold was dead, and ducal Burgundy came to an end, Dijon had another stroke of luck in becoming the Parliamentary capital of the Burgundian province—a point on which all its importance depended; and Dijon had not the first claim to this position, for under the Dukes the Parliamentary capital of Burgundy had generally been Beaune. A little work has been published lately by M. Henri Beaune, a magistrate of Dijon, and it informs us that it was owing to the efforts of two Dijon men, called Godran and Berbisey, that their city obtained this position.

Now began a new lease of prosperity for Dijon, though of a different order from its ancient state as the capital of an independent dukedom. The city was, it is true, no more than a provincial town; but it was the chief town of a vast and particularly wealthy and prosperous province. Before the centralization took place which has made Paris what it is, and atrophied the provincial capitals, such a place as Dijon can scarcely have been inferior to the Edinburgh of a hundred years ago in anything that makes a town worth living in. It had its ancient and rich noblesse, its comfortable *bourgeoisie*, its clerical and legal circles, and as much social and intellectual activity as must have perfectly sufficed to keep the inhabitants from stagnation. In one particular Dijon must have been generally superior to Edinburgh, and perhaps even to any other city; it was always celebrated for what came out of its cellars and kitchens, and was a paradise of eating and drinking. Burgundy is the classic land of wine-bibbing and good cookery; indeed, to tell the plain truth, we rather imagine that there is and has been too much of both in Burgundy. The rich productivity of the soil, and the taste and skill of the inhabitants, have produced habits of extravagant living so far as the table is concerned which the corresponding classes in England and Scotland could not imitate without much heavier expense. There are little country inns between Dijon and Chalon-sur-Saône where the furniture is wretched, but where the cookery and wines will bear the criticism of the most fastidious connoisseurs and gastronomers. In all that neighbourhood people think too much about eating and drinking, and spend upon it too large a proportion of their incomes. It is odd that M. Montégut couples together two such delights as "les charmes de l'érudition et les voluptés de la cuisine," and yet on reflection we perceive quite clearly how the two things came together in his mind. During the long delights of a perfect dinner the gastronomers, when they have also a taste for erudition, usually indulge the two passions at the same time by talking about learned subjects and tasting elaborate dishes. Dijon is a place where learned talk and good eating have gone together for ages:—"Oh! les grasses vies de savants, et les studieuses vies d'épicuriens!" exclaims M. Montégut; and he says, in comparing Dijon with Paris:—

L'existence des honnêtes gens de la société dijonnaise des deux derniers siècles n'eut de comparable que l'existence de la société parisienne pendant les cinquante années qui ont précédé la révolution, et encore donnerai-je volontiers le prix à Dijon. Il y eut dans l'existence parisienne du XVIII^e siècle trop de mouvement, d'inquiétude, de témérité, d'éléments nerveux pour le parfait bonheur; il y manqua un peu de cette animalité sanguine qui n'est pas moins nécessaire au bonheur qu'un certain degré de scepticisme, et cet atome d'animalité, on le trouve assez aisément dans les mœurs et la littérature dijonnaise; Alexis Piron fut, si vous voulez, l'exagération scandaleuse de cet élément.

M. Montégut is glad that Dijon has had the good sense to keep clear of that "fever of transformation" which took possession of most other French cities during the Empire. There have been changes of course to meet the necessities of modern life, but they have been made quietly and with judgment, never on the principle of Baron Haussmann. The place before the Hôtel de Ville is selected for especial commendation. Every reader who has visited Dijon is sure to remember that semicircle which permits you to have a good view of the edifice without letting you retire from it far enough to make it lose importance by distance; whilst, instead of feeling that the Hôtel de Ville is only one of the four sides of a great square, you see at once that the place is subordinate to the building.

One of the most curious of all the experiments which have had for their object the expression of a Gothic general idea by means of classical details is the church of St. Michael at Dijon. The architect was a native of the city, Hugues Sambin, who had had the advantage of studying under Michael Angelo, and had been honoured with that great man's friendship. Sambin was at the same time architect and sculptor. As architect he gave a front to his church which has the usual elements of a Gothic front, the three doorways, the twin towers, and the gable between the towers; but the windows, columns, and cornices are all Italian, and the towers are finished by Italian domes. As sculptor, Sambin himself carved the Last Judgment. The *portail* mixes in

its carvings the personages of both ancient Greek and Hebrew religions, such as Minerva, Apollo, Venus, Solomon, Judith, &c. Notwithstanding this strange mixture of heterogeneous elements, this church is always an object of interest, and gives a certain kind of pleasure even to the most critical. The truth is that, although not built according to rule, it has a great deal of lively character and originality.

M. Montégut devotes several pages to the glorious tombs of the Dukes. That of Philippe le Hardi, by Claux Slutter, was unquestionably a great stroke of genius, and certainly one of the grandest conceptions that ever entered into the brain of an artist. The other is merely an imitation of Slutter's idea, developed into greater luxuriance and elaboration of workmanship; and it appears that the tomb of Jean, Duke de Berry, of which some fragments exist at Bourges, was also on this model, at least so M. Montégut concludes from what remains of it:—

Le tombeau de Philippe le Hardi surprend autant par la perfection minutieuse du travail que les sculptures du puits de Moïse par la liberté de l'exécution. La statue de Philippe, presque de grandeur naturelle, est étendue sur une table de marbre noir; il est revêtu de ses ornements princiers; derrière sa tête deux anges présentent son casque à cimier de fleurs de lis qu'ils viennent de lui enlever, dirait-on, comme une coiffure dont il n'a plus que faire dans le royaume de paix où il est entré, et qui d'ailleurs serait gênante pour dormir le sommeil de l'éternité. . . . Mais la statue du duc n'est que l'accessoire de ce tombeau, dont la partie importante consiste dans les ornements; la disposition en est d'une originalité singulière. Sur les quatre côtés du monument se déroulent les longues galeries d'un cloître avec leurs arcades et leurs colonnettes, toutes pareilles à celles qui regnent encore aujourd'hui autour des cours intérieures des anciens monastères d'architecture gothique que la destruction a respectés. . . . Sous les arcades de ces nefs découpées à jour dans l'albâtre et s'avancant en saillie circule librement une longue procession de figurines représentant des moines et des dignitaires ecclésiastiques dans les attitudes les plus variées et avec les expressions de physionomie les plus diverses.

This description is followed by a page of excellent observations on the subject of originality. M. Montégut shows how easy it would be, with the help of a little disingenuousness, to deny to Slutter the merit of originality in a work which is full of it. A dishonest critic might easily adduce proofs that Slutter had borrowed all the essential ideas of his work from predecessors who had already embodied them in monuments of the same kind, but without giving them the same striking relief. Evidently the notion of a recumbent figure did not originate with him, neither did that of a procession; for these may be found in tombs of a preceding date; yet Slutter showed great boldness of invention in his magnificent development of these ideas. The tomb of Philippe le Hardi is nothing less than a splendid poem, and when M. Montégut says that Slutter treated the conceptions of his predecessors as Shakespeare developed the material which he perceived to be available in tiresome old stories, the comparison is not a whit too bold. The tomb is magnificent in general *ordonnance*, and full of dramatic character in the detail of the forty figures, every one of which has a distinct human individuality.

Villeneuve-sur-Yonne is one of the quietest little places mentioned in the book before us, but M. Montégut finds more to say about it than we should have expected. Of course we knew that he would mention Joubert, and we thought it very probable that Joubert would occupy the whole chapter; but he only occupies a page, a very good page, in which the author shows a true sympathy with that exquisite and delicate thinker. M. Montégut wondered what Joubert's country neighbours thought of him, and made some inquiries in order to ascertain this. "A poor sort of creature," was the answer; "morose, low-spirited, irregular in his habits, and who got up at two o'clock in the afternoon." As country folks in France are all early risers, they judge a man very severely who gets up late, and people in vigorous health are usually rather intolerant in their appreciation of invalids. The country opinion about Joubert was of course entirely founded upon externals, but there is excellent sense in what M. Montégut says about a reputation for eccentricity. It is not of the least use, he says, for intelligent people to renounce their own oddities in order to escape such a reputation, for everything is an eccentricity for the vulgar, even the simplest things; and if, out of deference to the opinion of his neighbours, M. Joubert had consented to get up at six o'clock in the morning, there would have immediately cropped up some meddlesome censor who would have wanted to regulate his meal-times for him, and settle the nature of the dishes that he ought to eat, and fix the shape of the clothes that he was to wear.

It is odd how the expression of the most respectable sentiments may cause a smile in others under certain circumstances. No sentiment can be more respectable than regret for that of a wife who has died; but when a man has lost two wives, and expresses his regret for both of them in terms of equal tenderness, it is difficult to escape a certain sense of the ludicrous. The most perfect existing instance of this equality is probably the following epitaph which M. Montégut found at St. Julien-du-Sault. The writer is for the second time a widower, and apostrophizes both wives simultaneously:—

Vos beaux jours ont passé comme la fleur des champs,
Qui naît et se flétrit dans un même printemps.
Vous n'êtes plus, vous, ô mes fidèles amies,
Vous, dont le tendre amour embellissait ma vie;
Vous m'avez laissé, hélas! triste le cœur;
En perdant mes amies j'ai perdu le bonheur.
Passant, priez pour mes amies!

The discoverer of this epitaph has a commentary upon it which is very amusing and very French, but in one point curiously forgetful of the doctrine of the Church. He seems to think that in the

next life the author of these verses, from the perfect equality of his affection, will be unable to make a choice, and therefore be "certainement bigame dans le ciel." Yet the nearest *curé* would have told M. Montégut that according to the Church there can be no embarrassment of this kind, for she teaches that men will have no wives at all in the next world. It is odd that so well-informed a writer should be ignorant of the orthodox view of so important a subject. He has a good story in the same chapter about a stone that had belonged to the Bastille, and which was built into a wall at St. Julien-du-Sault, in order, according to the inscription upon it, that this residue of tyranny might begin a new and purer existence "en recevant une destination utile." What an utter absence of the sense of humour is implied by the capacity to indite such an inscription as that!

Apropos of Auxerre, M. Montégut has a great deal of matter about Marshal Davoust, whose character he shows in a favourable light by many very interesting anecdotes. We select one of these which is agreeable for its combination of a knowledge of mankind with an admirable humanity:—

Pendant l'occupation de Hambourg, le Général Saulnier, grand prévôt du 13^e corps, arriva un jour consterné, indigné, auprès du maréchal Davout, lui apportant une caricature qu'il venait de faire saisir et qui représentait le maréchal sous une tente soutenue par quatre pendus et leurs potences. Il accourait lui demander d'en faire punir les auteurs; alors Davout s'écria en riant:—"Eh, mon cher, vous n'êtes pardieu qu'un enfant! Loin de punir l'auteur, saisissez la planche, et faites tirer cette caricature à 60,000 à 100,000 exemplaires; qu'on la répande soigneusement ensuite! Escorté de cette réputation effroyable, terrible, j'inspirerai tant de peur que je n'aurai besoin de faire pendre personne."

The traveller who explores this part of France ought not to omit Avallon and Vézelay. Avallon is prettily and pleasantly situated on a hill with a stream running in a deep gorge close to the base of it, but Vézelay is one of the strangest places in Europe. Imagine a wild desert of bare hills, and a road through the deep valleys between them, leading, as it seems, to nothing but wilder desert. After long travelling over this you come upon a hill of imposing aspect, and on the very summit of this, perched like a feudal castle on its rock, stands a magnificent church, a cathedral in everything but the name, not less vast, nor less magnificent, than the cathedrals which are the pride of populous cities. M. Montégut says it is like Noah's Ark on Mount Ararat. Yet it was only the church of a lonely monastery, the most independent of all monasteries that ever were, whose abbots were elected like Popes without being subject to the approval of any superior episcopal authority, and reigned like independent sovereigns over their temporal vassals.

We are sorry not to have space to follow M. Montégut in such interesting places as Cluny and Autun, but we may, in conclusion, express a hearty approval of his method and purpose in travelling. He has quite the necessary interest in history and literature, and the only serious defect in his intellectual equipment for the execution of such a plan appears to be an insufficient knowledge of architecture. A tourist in old French towns misses a great deal when this knowledge is wanting. You may travel without it in Canada or Australia, but scarcely in old France.

ROSE AND RUE.*

BELIEVING that the prevalence of any practice implies the existence of a corresponding theory, we have for a long time past imagined that a very curious theory obtained among a large section of the English nation with regard to the writing of fiction. The fact that this section comprises the whole of the novel-writing public will indicate how large it is; and the novel called *Rose and Rue* will, we think, afford good proof of the truth of our conjecture. This book is one which has met with much praise, and presumably with some success; and that it has some claims both to success and to praise we are not disposed to deny. It has been written, however, strictly in accordance with the theory of which we have spoken. In explanation of that theory it is allowable to assume that the writing of fiction is to be classed as an art. It is probable at least that any one among the myriad producers of novels would raise a clamour of indignation were he denied the title of artist. But what does the ordinary novelist accomplish to deserve that title? What would be thought of a man who professed to paint a picture without having learnt how to handle a brush? What of one who pretended to compose an opera without being at the trouble of studying thorough-bass? Or of one who should affect to be a sculptor without any knowledge of anatomy? If any persons have attempted these rash feats the world has heard but little of them, and they have certainly not found a large following.

The art of romance-writing would seem to form a startling exception to all ordinary rules. The creed that it is possible to write a novel worthy to be read without any kind of training or experience, and with the very slightest exercise of thought or care, has found an acceptance little short of universal. The growth of this strange belief may possibly be traced back to the fact that in these days every one learns to write and spell with a certain amount of accuracy. Consequently many people are capable of making marks upon paper with a pen which shall have some kind of meaning whose efforts would be likely to prove unintelligible if brush and palette or marble and chisel were substituted for pen and paper. Numberless men and women fall into the bad habit of making such

marks, and by its indulgence they perhaps do little harm to any one but themselves. Some time may possibly be wasted over the reading of their trivial and worthless productions, but scarcely enough to be counted against them for a serious evil. It is conceivable indeed that a thoroughly bad novel may accomplish a certain amount of good by producing a violent reaction against its class in the minds of those who peruse it. When ignorance or disregard of grammar, absence of care for style, vulgarisms of language, and inconsistencies of character are heaped together in the pages of a book wherein no redeeming quality is found, that book may be trusted on the whole to accomplish its mission by disgusting its readers. The danger of such crying faults as these gaining ground at all is that they spread with a destructive rapidity as swift as that of the American river weed, or they may be perhaps more aptly compared to certain noxious fungoid growths which, fastening on a tree, pass unheeded at first, and spread gradually upwards until they compel attention to their corroding presence. The easily caught infection of heedlessness and disorder in every essential point of style has spoilt much literary work which might otherwise have been good. The value of thoughts and perceptions is marred by their being clothed in loosely-constructed and ill-considered language, as the lustre of a stone may be diminished by the squalor of its setting. The "bald disjointed chat" by means of which the average modern novelist conveys his or her ideas might produce a distaste for ideas of even greater intrinsic value. The use of slipshod grammar and involved construction is not without warrant among writers of some reputation. It has seldom been carried further by a writer who has yet to make a reputation than by Mrs. Compton Reade. Here, by way of illustration, is a sentence which for length, involution, defiance of construction, and difficulty of understanding, may rival the most curious passages of Thucydides, though in other points the comparison will not perhaps hold good:—

Thus, Shobdon-cum-Shackerley, being one of the sleepest, peacefullest villages to be found even in the sleepy, peaceful west; a fruitful, hill-sheltered, tree-fanned, rose-wreathed morsel of a place, with but two respectable-sized houses within its borders—one, the vicarage, now vacant, owing to the recent death of the vicar, and the other this Shobdon Grange, whither you have already penetrated; and Farmer Fowke, the proprietor of this last-named tenement by right of heritage, continued through long generations, being Conservative by inclination, as well as a sense of fitness—it is scarcely to be wondered at that innovation hesitated to cross his threshold, and that the shadows held high revel in his kitchen, as being old and brown and full of memories, and in every way the very place for shadows to hold high revel in.

The imitation of Dickens's manner at the conclusion of this bewildering sentence may be noted as one of many imitations of many authors which disfigure Mrs. Compton Reade's novel. Lest we should be suspected of deliberately choosing the most glaring instance of incoherency which we could find, here is another shorter, but no less surprising, passage:—

"Dear me!" sighed Tryphena to herself that night, as having read through her note, which had throughout the day resided in undisturbed seclusion in the uttermost depths of her pocket—"why, it seems all beginning and end, and no middle at all." And then she read it through again, the silly!

Most readers will pronounce upon this sentence much the same verdict as Tryphena did upon her note. Only the note had an end; the sentence has none.

An idea which Mrs. Compton Reade possesses in common with almost every authoress of a certain calibre is that force and pungency are to be acquired by the simple means of a repetition of words. There are occasions no doubt upon which such a method has been employed with good effect; there is, for instance, the "to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow" of Macbeth. There are also occasions when even one employment of a phrase may be deemed superfluous. The idea that reiteration is the same thing as strength and point frequently expresses itself in the form of beginning a period with the two or three words which close the preceding passage. Thus we are told that a person went to a room in order "to read." Then the weight of a full stop and the dignity of a capital letter are employed to lend fresh importance to the words "To read." It is perhaps not out of accordance with this order of writing that the author should say to the reader, "Martha was rather proud, *between you and I*, of the familiarity," and on another occasion inform him that the hero "would willingly have *lotos-ate* another month away." The italicized word is a curious combination of bad grammar and the affectation of fine writing. The same young man who does not idle, but *lotos-eats* away his time, is said, when he takes the woman whom he loves into his arms and kisses her, to "deal with her lover-wise." When the narrator of his history desires to let us know that he said goodbye and went away, she writes, "And then he, with a great hand-squeeze, took his departure." When an obstacle comes across the path of one of the characters, we learn that it "barred progress much as might an aggressively-inclined bull or a *venient* cannon-ball." One may without much difficulty conclude that the unusual word "*venient*" stands for the ordinary word "coming." It is more difficult to determine wherein lies the likeness between a cannon-ball and a bull. The task of pointing out every blunder in grammar, every fault and extravagance to be found in *Rose and Rue*, would demand a space equal to at least one of the three volumes that compose the book.

We have dwelt at some length upon these blunders and errors, because there is evidence in the novel that its author is capable of writing something more worthy of attention. In order to do that she must cast off the slovenly and affected method which over-weights the merit of her present production. We are inclined to

* *Rose and Rue*. A Novel. By Mrs. Compton Reade. 3 vols. London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1874.

think also that her choice of a subject has not been altogether wise. Her powers evidently lie in the direction of observation and analysis of character. She has burdened herself in *Rose and Rue* with a mystery, the treatment of which calls for some startling inconsistencies in the development of her characters. The writers who excel in the handling of dark and secret plots probably first catch their mystery, and adapt their characters to its requirements. In reading Mrs. Compton Reade's work one gets the impression that the conception of the characters was a thing quite apart from the plot, and that they were distorted to fit into it as need occurred. The characters might have been good without the secret to which they are subservient. The secret is not distinguished either by originality or skilful handling.

The story opens in the year 1821 with the discovery of a gentleman wounded in an encounter with a highwayman near Shobdon Grange, the chief house in a West country village. To this house he is carried for shelter and for recovery from his wounds. That he should be young, handsome, and wealthy, and should during his convalescence fall in love with Tryphena Fowke, the daughter of the house, is properly in accordance with precedent. It is not beyond the experience of life to be gathered from novels that the highwayman who has wounded Robert Valoynes, the young and wealthy hero, should be no other than Tryphena Fowke's father. To these comparatively simple conditions a complicating element seems necessary. This is afforded by the passion of a Dissenting minister, Acts Latchet, for Tryphena, and his discovery of her father's secret practice of highway robbery. Robert Valoynes, the hero, is, after the manner of heroes, a convenient peg whereon to hang gay apparel and pleasant manners, together with views and opinions much in advance of his time. Jacob Fowke, the father, who combines the professions of farmer and highwayman, is designed with good intentions, but the very contradictory qualities which he is supposed to possess are not handled with sufficient adroitness to make him appear probable. There is some interest in the character of Tryphena, but it conveys the same sense of inconsistency as does her father's. It is difficult to reconcile her clever sayings and her excellent sense in some directions with the narrowness of her views and education, and her extraordinary folly in other directions. To take a minor matter, she is many times described as looking up to her brutal father as the perfection of humanity in every way, and yet we are told of her blushing for his discourtesy to his guests. In Miss Fowke, the rigid and sharp-tongued, but kind-hearted, aunt of Tryphena, and in Acts Latchet, the minister, the writer may be credited with success. Whether a man so schooled to self-control, so bent on self-advancement as Latchet, would have persisted in the pursuit of a girl whose love he could not hope to win, is an open question. The whole attitude of the man's mind, however, and the way in which it is determined by circumstances, is depicted with some power:—

The elect at Coatham, Shobdon, and the country round about called him a second Paul; and in the matters of eloquence and internal disquietude—the disquietude of one with whom, when good is present, evil is never far away; of one who, with a mind set on righteousness, is ever hankering after those corrupt gratifications and allurements of the senses, than which no devil is more inimical to the well-being of the soul—the comparison was fair enough; but there the parallel ceased, grew less justifiable year by year, would continue less justifiable as time went on. A man who, having been clean at twenty, ponders, plans, does at forty as ponders, plans, and does the Reverend Mr. Latchet, is little likely ever to retrace his downward steps. And yet the man wanted to be better, could get joy out of the thought of change, found his greatest happiness in the consideration, the contemplation of a purity so virginal, so profound, so exquisite that it reflected beauty on the soul which reverently beheld it.

From the power of observation displayed in *Latchet*, in Miss Fowke, and in some minor characters, and from some descriptions which in spite of their affected style are singularly vivid, it may be inferred that the writer of *Rose and Rue* might write well if she would take the trouble to learn. It may be hoped that she will in future cultivate her talent in the right direction, and avoid those sins against taste and syntax to which we have called attention.

MRS. COOPER'S LIFE OF STRAFFORD.*

WE remember how a well-known philanthropist, whose omnivorous love of literature has since expanded into a still more comprehensive kind of benevolence, once indited a sonnet to his paper-knife as his Excalibur. But there are books which seem designed to test the most robust literary appetite, and from which the most callous of critics is fain to shrink with a mixture of kindly compunction and uncontrollable heaviness of mind. Such a book, we feel constrained to say, is the in many respects meritorious *Life of Strafford* before us. Its general style and manner are those of a prize essay on a well-worn subject (say, the best means of converting the Papists of Ireland to a purer form of faith); and it is compiled with an industry at once so praiseworthy and so hopeless that no examiner who refused to accord it "honourable mention" would be spared a ranking regret in his conscience for the remainder of his life. Its length, which is by no means inconsiderable, seems the fault of an accidentally ample subject rather than of malice prepense on the part of its author; nor can it be more than a playful phrase when she on one occasion describes the limits of her space as preventing her

from inserting a document of interest. When indeed she approaches the climax of her narrative, she appears to recognize the inevitable necessity of sparing herself and her readers the reproduction of the whole of her materials, and remarks with touching resignation that

As the trial lasted fifteen days, and occupies a thick folio volume, it is, of course, impossible to give the full details in the present account. They lie open in the pages of *Knushworth* to all who are willing to pay the price of the thought and labour necessary to master the daily items and form their opinion from the regular reports.

It is due to Mrs. Cooper's industry and conscientiousness that we should express our assurance that personally she would have been quite equal to the effort, in which she would have been sustained by her unfailing capacity for making commonplace reflections, the surest solace of a well-regulated mind.

We must disclaim, without the slightest affectation, any desire of speaking otherwise than respectfully of a lady who, after recovering from what in her dedication she describes as a seemingly desperate illness, has been able to prepare a thankoffering which is the result of so much honest labour. The book before us bears no signs of carelessness—except in some occasional oddities of syntax hardly worth dwelling upon. Mrs. Cooper has by no means contented herself with turning into the capacious mould of this biography previous popular narratives bearing more or less closely upon its subject; the use which she has, e.g. made of Mr. Forster appears to have been singularly moderate. She has, on the other hand, referred with a commendable zeal to first-hand sources; and in some instances—notably in the case of the letters printed by her from Lord Houghton's collection—has placed before the general reader much that can hardly but be new to him. Nor can the management of her narrative be said upon the whole to lack perspicuity, though she is rather given to fly off suddenly at the end of a paragraph, leaving one unprepared for an equally swift return, and though we feel bound to recommend her to follow in her next book the example of "the greatest of biographers," as, if we remember right, she somewhere calls Mr. Forster. Mr. Forster's merits as a biographer render him safe against the consequences of flattery; but if there is one minor habit which endears him to his readers, it is that of furnishing marginal analyses clear enough to elucidate the most complicated bluebook, and indices copious even to luxuriance. Such aids Mrs. Cooper disdains; but in other respects her *Life of Strafford* is as little obscure as it is empty or flippant. And yet it is emphatically unreadable, and unintentionally illustrates the painful truth that the principal use of a book by no means devoid of merit may be that of a warning example.

After all, such a work as this must be intended as a contribution to historical literature, and must be judged according to its claim. Many efforts are made at the present day to promote an intelligent love of historical reading in wider spheres than can hitherto be said to have been affected by a tendency in that direction. It is, to our minds, an absolute certainty that these efforts will end in failure, unless, while paying constant attention to the necessity of enforcing the indispensable qualities of accuracy and clearness, they succeed in engaging the imaginative as well as the reasoning faculties of the mind, and in arousing the moral emotions as well as employing the intellectual powers. Such being our conviction, we have the less hesitation in taking this opportunity of touching on the other side of the subject. As the study of history bears its fruits in historical composition of whatever kind, it proves its adequacy or inadequacy as a mental discipline according as it proves itself to have been carried on in such a way as to maintain a balance between the critical and the imaginative faculties. When it appears to have merely accumulated the materials for a loose play of sympathies and antipathies, without enabling the student to go to the bottom of anything, or to arrive at an instinctive knowledge of where the actual difficulties of his special task begin, it has done no more than supply themes for rhetorical exercises which, however laboriously carried on, must fall away from those who occupy themselves with them, whether as writers or readers, like so many dry leaves.

The author of the book before us, which is by no means an unfavourable specimen of its class, may rest assured that there are other names, freely advertised as eminent in our "historical literature," which might have even more pointedly been used to illustrate our remarks. But there is perhaps no branch of historical composition which more easily lends itself to a merely rhetorical method of treatment than the biographical. The subject of a biography seems to define itself; the biographer seems to have an opportunity of starting as freshly with his hero as Mr. Froude started with Henry VIII.; the facts seem within a more or less manageable compass; the duty of selection seems to be certain to determine itself in the course of the work, and the comment sure to come in here and there as a pleasing and natural relief. It is, however, precisely where the conditions of a literary task appear at first sight easiest and most elastic that the exercise of that self-control which the discipline of regular study alone can render habitual is least to be dispensed with. Every human career is a result of its antecedents; every individual life is not only a part of, but stands in a proportionate relation to, the life of a nation and of an age. The "Life and Times" system of biography has been invented in consciousness of these obvious truths, but its dangers and difficulties are manifold; it is apt to loosen the thread of a narrative into intolerable laxity, or to entangle it with other threads, or to allow it to drop altogether under a cloud of what it

* *The Life of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, and Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.* By Elizabeth Cooper. 2 vols. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1874.

is usual to call digressions, but what, we observe, Mrs. Cooper prefers to call "divergences."

It is time, however, that we should briefly indicate the applicability of these strictures to the work before us. The author of this *Life of Strafford* has accumulated with commendable industry a sufficient abundance of details in the private as well as in the public life of her hero. But where the life really requires elucidation she has invariably slurred over the difficulty, or has frankly broken down in confronting it. Cleveland, we think it was, said of Strafford that "he spent his life here in a mist," and certainly the same may be said of the Strafford of this biography. Neither the inconsistencies of his earlier career, nor the extraordinary step by which he, so to speak, put his head in the lion's mouth, are in the least degree satisfactorily accounted for; in fact the latter difficulty is virtually passed by altogether. The various elements in Strafford's character, such as his biographer conceives them to have been, she has ranged together, side by side, something like the stops in an organ, any one of which may be pulled out in turn when the instrument gives an uncertain sound. Of an attempt at combination there is hardly any evidence. In the Table of Contents we are attracted, under the heading of Chapter III., by the promising words: "Succession of Charles I.—Character of Wentworth at this time." We turn to the corresponding passage in the text, and are informed that "At the age of thirty-two he had secured a character for strong domestic affections, ardour in friendship, order in the management of his affairs, justice to his tenants, unceasing industry in the disposal of his time, and strict conformity to the ordinances of the established religion." An oracular observation follows to the effect that any intimacy between Wentworth and James I. would have been impossible:—"The subject could not have stooped to the familiarity of the King, the King would never have ventured to address the subject by such diminutives as set him at his ease with 'Steenie.'" We seem on the brink of a discovery when we learn that "the impression of royalty left by James may have had more to do with the reception of the first acts of his successor by a formal aristocrat than is generally dreamed of"; but we have only this crumb of interpretation to carry us from the prologue into Act I. of the hero's public life.

Here it is to be noted that Mrs. Cooper shows, from a hitherto unpublished letter in the State Papers of Charles I. (Domestic Series), how Wentworth applied for the Presidency of the Council of the North "before he became a champion of popular liberty"; but the "riddle," as she calls it, which this fact presents she does not attempt to solve. Wentworth's refusal to contribute to the loan in 1627, in consequence of which the King ordered him to be imprisoned, was, in his biographer's opinion, "the day of his greatness"—"the hour when his good angel seemed to have won the victory." The "happiness and glory" of his life are held by Mrs. Cooper to have closed with his acceptance of a peerage and the coveted Presidency of the North in 1629; but she leaves us in some doubt as to her judgment of his motives in taking this step, and concludes the subject with a vague conjecture that "it is yet quite possible that Wentworth did honestly believe in a new order of things when he accepted his new title."

This kind of writing, while it does credit to the author's candour, is not likely to be of much use in enabling the reader to judge of crucial questions in an historical biography. At the same time we by no means complain of the feminine tone which this book receives from Mrs. Cooper's sympathy with her hero in his domestic affections, and in his personal sufferings from that "miserable health" which she even seems to think might have suggested a merciful excuse in the debate on his impeachment. It is the more surprising to note her relentless antipathy to the memory of King Charles I., at whom no phrase from "intense stupidity" onwards seems to her too bad to throw. To Archbishop Laud's faithfulness as a friend she pays an impassioned tribute; otherwise she evidently regards "poor Laud," as she on one occasion contemptuously calls him, as a bigot whose policy, in the case of Scotland, was "intense idiocy and ignorance." To us this kind of writing is of a character which seems to preclude the necessity of replying to it. Mrs. Cooper will hardly set up on her own behalf a plea similar to that which she urges on behalf of the Scotch Covenanters. "It is all very well," she observes after quoting a selection of curses uttered against the bishops and their friends by the Covenanted ministers, "to hold up the hands at these uncharitable utterances, but for those who maintain the same belief—in the 109th Psalm, for instance—as the Puritans, and treat all who look on any part of the Bible as mere human utterances as wicked heretics, it must be difficult to deny the celestial right of these honest preachers to follow their authority for such sentiments." It may, by the by, be a trivial question of composition; but what is the precise meaning of "belief in the 109th Psalm"?

Of the fatal flow of words in this book we have no wish to multiply specimens. Mrs. Cooper's account of Strafford's Irish administration will, we think, be found the fullest and most interesting part of her work; nor can we have any hesitation in admitting that a candid judgment of this administration must be of a mixed nature. The evidence of Sir Harry Vane's papers was in reality of a trumpety nature, and, whatever Pym and Hampden may have thought, it seems clear that the impeachment must have broken down. On the question as to the justifiableness of the Bill of Attainder Mrs. Cooper's remarks are devoid of value. Hallam's argument on the subject shows how the proceeding may be condemned as a political act, though not as a crime; and Hallam has, in our opinion, overrated the effect which, as a political act, it

produced. The general question, of course, goes to the very root of the theory of the Parliamentary State. For ourselves, we can form no conception of such a State which excludes the possibility of recourse to Bills of Pains and Penalties, among which Bills of Attainder are to be reckoned. And thus, as is rightly observed by Ranke, in his unhappily still untranslated *History of England*, not only was Strafford's guilt purely political, but his execution is likewise to be regarded as an act of policy. As such it must be judged; and all exclamations on its vindictiveness are, in the mouth of an historical writer, mere rhetoric. But we will allow Mrs. Cooper to have the last word on this subject before we part from her with a feeling of regret that so much honourable industry and sentiment should not have been turned to more profitable account by means of a closer discipline in judgment and a more habitual self-restraint in expression:—

By a strange turn of fortune Strafford was suffering from the most bitter, if the most salutary, of all punishments. He was learning by personal experience the effects of the same injustice he had inflicted on others. Still it was injustice, and therefore cannot be quoted with approbation of those who inflicted it. Retaliation is no part of the English law, and that law alone was the standard by which Lord Strafford ought to have been tried. It is quite true that it is a clear part of the plan of nature that men are to learn through their errors to feel their way from wrong to right, to know what obstacles exist simply by stumbling against them. But this principle cannot be applied to human systems. The laws of nature are perfect from the beginning. Once understood, they can always be obeyed. They are never created suddenly, and for special occasions, and applying to all alike give all the same chance of benefit who learn to obey. But human codes continually change, which are affected by time, place, person, and circumstance. And because a man has broken a law to another, to punish him by breaking it towards himself, or by inventing one to suit his previously-committed crime, is about as great a contradiction of those natural principles to which Pym appealed as for the earth to change her course and the seasons to remain the same.

BIRCH'S COUNTRY ARCHITECTURE.*

THE multiplication of works designed to teach novices in the mystery of building what to aim at and what to avoid in the construction of dwelling-houses may reasonably be welcomed as long as the works in question are sufficiently clear and practical. Unfortunately the tendency of publishing architects is not unnaturally towards a display of their pet conceptions, with the aid of elaborate and fanciful drawings, while little attention is given to those minor details which, to the person in quest of a house or cottage, constitute the comfort of life. It is on this account that we cannot approach Mr. Birch's *Country Architecture* with the same unmixed goodwill and confidence as Mr. Kerr's *Small Country House*, or Mr. Gervase Wheeler's *Choice of a Dwelling*. Nevertheless it would be unfair to condemn or underrate that which is, it seems, only an instalment of the author's original intention; for he tells us in the first page of his preface that "his studies in planning mansion-house, jointure-house, rectory, and parsonage, and combining the useful with the beautiful in each," are of necessity "deferred to a companion volume." From what Mr. Birch has now put forth the reader may gather a fair conception of the collateral buildings of divers kinds connected with a larger or smaller country estate, and certainly will rarely be misled by any under-statement of the cost of building. With a certain looseness of arrangement, which also affects his literary style, if we may judge by the cumbrousness of the first sentence of p. viii. in his preface, he has divided his present volume into four parts:—(1) Labourers' Cottages and Institutes and Mechanics' Dwellings; (2) Entrance Lodges, Entrance Gates, and Bridges; (3) Gardeners' and Keepers' Lodges, Kennels, Cottage Laundry and Cottage Hospital, Stewards' Houses, Farmhouse and Buildings, Stable Offices, &c.; and (4) Infant-schools, School-houses, Curacy-house, Country Residences and Halls; and it is obvious that the sorting of his matter might have been more judicious. Still, if we take Mr. Birch's work as we find it, there can be no doubt that it contains many serviceable hints and an amount of valuable matter which only needs to be better digested. As he ascends in Part IV. to the mansion or hall of which the buildings of his three former parts are only the adjuncts or surroundings, we confess to a feeling of disappointment, which may possibly have been designed by the author to sharpen our curiosity for his companion-volume. In the meantime, however, we shall confine ourselves to the consideration of that part of "country architecture" with which the volume deals with more or less completeness.

To begin then with labourers' cottages, whether single, in pairs, or in groups, our author's postulates respecting the site and conditions of these are indisputable. He would place them near the farm-buildings, which should themselves be central, and would have them lie back some ten yards from the road, but not at the extreme rear of the plot, lest the space out of sight should be too limited for sanitary purposes. Not to mention the aspects desirable for the living rooms, as to which few are without sound ideas, he rightly lays down that cottages should stand on rising ground, and ground easy to drain. Outbuildings should not be less than thirty yards or so from the dwellings, and the piggeries should be furthest off. Mr. Birch is probably right in discouraging the building of more than four cottages in a block, though up to that point there is security in numbers, and perhaps in the assignment of a fourth or eighth of an acre to each cottage (if as a minimum); but we

* *Country Architecture: a Series of Executed Works and Designs for Buildings connected with Landed Property.* By John Birch, Architect. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1874.

think that when he disapproves of a cowshed and an allotment of three or four acres to a labourer, "because it makes him independent of his proper calling, and causes labour to be scarce," he forgets the advantage of a few such holdings on a sufficiently large estate as a premium to the frugal and industrious, who by the time they have spent their prime in their employer's service may retire thereupon and constitute a truly exemplary class. For such persons it would not be needful to build a larger or more expensive style of cottage. The Marquis of Ailesbury's cottages at Clinch, near Pewsey, are rightly described by the author as "quite as good in arrangement," though not so ornate in external appearance, as any in his work. In these pairs each scullery communicates with the entrance lobby independently of the living-rooms; and it is pointed out that with slight alteration and outlay, the living-rooms in such a case might be made parlours, and the sculleries living-rooms. And this trifling reconstruction, involving at most a lean-to for a scullery, or perhaps a bit of a dairy, would obviously fit such a cottage or cottages for the residence of the cow-keeping "emeritus" whose case we have glanced at. The cost of such a pair of cottages, commendably simple and fairly roomy, was about 330*l*. The odd seventy pounds would probably cover the cost of alterations. It is a pardonable weakness in architects and their rich employers to think that cottage buildings cannot be too quaintly designed in order to produce a thoroughly old English effect, and doubtless such quaintness may be compassed without excessive extra cost by diversity of outline in projecting roofs, eaves, gables, and barge-boards. But a rational taste will revolt against a fancy of this kind being ridden too hard; and a medium course in the matter of barge-boarding the gables and dormers and hooding the doors of a cottage is likely to be most pleasing to the eye, as well as most conducive to a long term of tenable repair. Some of Mr. Birch's designs are almost too pretty, and bespeak the same poetical view of his craft as is evinced in his theory of a model village situate at the point of intersection of two high roads, in order to get in a village well as a pleasing and characteristic feature. To our prosaic mind a multiplication of private pumps and tanks would be preferable to a central well, which is usually a place of mingled peril and attraction to the village children, and of quarrels and disputes to the village mothers. At the same time candour bids us say that, for inornateness, combined with reduction of expense, and some little sacrifice of the picturesque, no pair of cottages in this volume can equal that designed by the author for the "Select Committee of the House of Lords on Improvement of Land by Limited Owners." These serve every purpose, and, whilst allowing each cottage more cubical feet than his original Prize Cottages for the Society of Arts, have been erected at a cost of 300*l*. the pair. In Plate No. II., design A, we have a cottage erected for Sir H. Selwyn-Ibbetson, which is sufficiently ornamental, and, whilst not over-costly, has the advantage of a bedroom on the ground-floor. But a comparison of this design with its companion, B, a cottage erected for Sir A. Elton, shows the sacrifice of space in the living-room which such a convenience entails. The living-room in A is limited to 12 ft. 6 in. by 11 ft., whilst on the Clevedon Court Estate, where the bedrooms are all on the chamber-floor, the living-room is 14 ft. by 13 ft., and the largest bedroom 14 ft. by 9 ft. In the Great Bedwyn Cottages (Plate IV., p. 19) a downstairs bedroom is managed with less sacrifice of living-room, and in these all the bedrooms, upstairs and down, are 12 ft. by 8 ft., or 12 ft. by 12 ft. Lord Stanley of Alderley's cottages (Plate VI.) are more roomy as regards the living-room and main bedroom, but somewhat more elaborate in exterior; the Effingham Hill Cottages are roomier still, though, in the latter case, at a proportionate additional cost; and Admiral Phipps Hornby has simpler, yet not less commodious, cottages at a cost of 320*l*. the pair, inclusive of a large rainwater tank. Whilst all single cottages seem to require three bedrooms, common sense dictates that it is unnecessary that these should be of a uniform size; and in the blocks of cottages of which the volume before us furnishes several examples, it is not amiss that a centre cottage should have but two bedrooms, to suit some old labourer or pensioner without encumbrances. We do not see, however, why, in the Quatt Block of three (Plate IX., p. 24) the largest bedroom in the central cottage should be so large in proportion to the largest in those that flank it—the only fault we have to find with these very picturesque and appropriate Shropshire buildings. The three cost 500*l*. *en bloc*. Lord Spencer's block of four at Althorp (Plate X., p. 26) is a combination, in good taste and with skill and success, of two pairs of cottages similar to those in Plate III. The lump sum for these was 512*l*, or 128*l*. apiece, which is not dear as prices go. The Yeovil Railway cottages in Plate XI. are dearer and not so effective, but the difference in point of cost is explicable by the larger dimensions. The effect of grouping blocks and pairs of cottages in larger combinations is shown in Plate XI., A, "a general view of a group at Great Bedwyn." The neat garden-ground in front, the effective elevation, and the trim look of these homesteads are significant of wealth well employed in making neighbours and retainers happy and comfortable. Much also, from the same point of view, is to be learnt from the mechanics' dwellings at Bocking and Halstead, which take up the remaining pages and designs of Part I., where the thoughtfulness of the landlord and employer has provided skilfully and completely for the due cubical space, the warming, and the ventilation of every room in each dwelling. In the careful specification applicable to a cottage or other building which Mr. Birch adds to this part are to be found some practical hints which deserve con-

sideration. There will be no demur to his preference of stone chimney-pieces to painted wood substitutes, or of plastered and coloured to papered living-rooms and bedrooms. We are not so sure that Staffordshire plain-tiling is so infinitely superior to the slate roof or to the best stone tile; and the question of ordinary cess-pits as against earth-closets awaits perhaps its solution until the labourer is better educated.

One plate and description in Part I., to wit the labourers' reading-room and attendant's residence opposite to p. 29, would find its place more fitly in Part III. or Part IV. with cottage laundries, cottage hospitals, infants' schools, and the like. The reading-room is 30 ft. by 20 ft., with an open roof, and the living accommodation—for an elderly female servant or widow—is ample. But we question whether this sort of building, of which the approximate cost is 500*l*., is not too expensive for the experiment it is designed to solve. In one of Mr. Holt Beever's pleasant books about farming, he details the more inexpensive processes by which an old barn or a garden-house was converted to the same purpose; and wisdom would suggest the utmost deliberation before closing with an estimate for a permanent and ornamental building, which village caprices might render useless and nugatory at any time. We should be less timid in the case of the cottage hospital, or of the cottage contrived to pay the double debt of a laundry and a Sunday-school; indeed we should say that the cottage reading-room ought to be only alternatively so used. The plan of the cottage laundry (XXIV.) is good and roomy, with three fair-sized bedrooms in the chamber-plan, a washhouse 14 ft. by 8 ft., a laundry or school room 18 ft. by 12 ft., as well as a scullery 11 ft. by 8 ft. With regard to the village hospital (Plate No. XXXII.) our only doubt is whether it be not too costly and elaborate. Bearing in mind Dr. Horace Swete's exhaustive handbook, on which we commented in these columns some four years ago, it strikes us that the estimated cost (1850*l*.) and some of the details overstep the modesty of the cottage hospital, and ape a greater and more central establishment. The secret of success in such establishments is simplicity of plan. Nevertheless we admit the author's tact in his arrangement of such difficult chambers as the mortuary and the convalescent ward. Closet, staircase, and lobby would probably shut off the operating-room from the latter quite effectually. Another design in Part III. is for a cottage dairy with a cottage for the bailiff, intended as an adjunct to the home farm. To our thinking it sacrifices the house-space to the proportions of the dairy, which is partly underground, has an encaustic-tiled floor, and an ornamental tiled stand for the utensils, an open roof, and walls lined with blue and white Dutch tile in panels of a special design for each side of the octagon. These things are of course a luxury, but that a bailiff under the same roof should have but two moderate-sized bedrooms is surely inconsistent. And if the dairy is simply an *affaire de luxe*, a better and more perfect model is to be seen at Mr. Miller Mundy's, at Shipley in Nottinghamshire.

That which chiefly strikes us in the "entrance lodges" of the second part is the disproportion of room and domestic comfort to finish and appearance. Thus the lodge built for Colonel St. Leger (No. XVI.), at Park Hill near Rotherham, is an elaborate structure of magnesian limestone, with a roof of patterned Broseley tiles, and eaves, gables and porch finished with handsome ornamental barge-boards. As it is at the junction of several high roads, and contiguous to a handsome stone bridge, and handsome entrance gates of stone and iron, this lodge is designedly elaborate. We are not told the cost of the bridge; but lodge and gates swallow the best half of a thousand pounds. In fact, it is too sumptuous for an ordinary lodge, and yet, it has but two bedrooms. It is the same with the less showy, but more expensive, entrance-lodge at Rowfont, near Crawley, which is all on the ground plan, and is in connexion, if not keeping, with very handsome entrance gates. Mr. Birch—wrongly to our thinking—affects this single-storeyed style of lodge, of which the plainest sample is his entrance lodge at Upton near Didcot, with all its accommodation (not much, seeing that there is but one bedroom—10 ft. by 8 ft.) under one roof, without any lean-to or break of level. This is surely unpicturesque; nor is it easy to see why the occupant of a lodge should be confined to narrower limits than the tenant of a centre-house in the cottage-group. Is it altogether true in taste that a lodge harmonizes best with its surroundings if all the accommodation is on one floor? We doubt it, and incline rather to the irregularly-roofed building which is a compromise between one and two storeys, in that it has an attic here or there standing out from the roof with a pretty gable, or perhaps perched above the entrance-porch. Such a lodge is that at Davyhulme Hall, near Manchester (Plate XIX.), built of red brick, with a half-timbered-work finish of the chamber floor. Here the irregular outline, caused by the projecting windows of the bedroom, the chimney-head, and the open porch, is very pleasant to the eye. But here, too, there is a strange scantiness of sleeping accommodation.

We have little space left for even the mention of the farm-houses, stables, and smaller and larger mansions, which make up the rest of the book. It strikes us from the fewness of examples of these in comparison with the cottages and lodges that the author means them only as a foretaste of his future volume. He presents us with plans of country and suburban residences near Shields, Stroud, and Didcot, estimated to cost from two to three or four thousand pounds apiece, and a rather elaborate restoration of Grafton Hall, for Lord Stanley of Alderley. In the smaller houses we note what we think a bad plan, though the in-

tention of it is good—namely, the connexion of the library with the drawing-room, or morning-room, by an arched opening with folding-doors. Any one accustomed to use his library will be certain to bric up the opening after a twelvemonth's experience of the interruption to study and quiet which result from this arrangement. The library should stand aloof from such living-rooms as are in constant use during the day. A desideratum, too, in these plans of larger and more luxurious dwellings is some definite account of the proposed sanitary arrangements, the warming, the ventilation, and the drainage. When Mr. Birch goes into committee with himself as to his companion-volume, we should move that it be an instruction to him to be more definite as to these points than as to the position of my lady's bedroom or my lord's dressing-room.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

THE second edition of Malouet's *Mémoires** gives us an opportunity of once more recommending to our readers one of the best sources of information on the history of the French Revolution. Thoroughly attached to the principles of constitutional government, Malouet never forgets to show that the cause of true liberty was indissolubly united to that of the monarchy, and that it was lost as soon as the mob got the power into its own hands. The combined testimony of M. Guizot, M. de Montalembert, and King Charles X. in favour of these *Mémoires* will, we doubt not, be fully confirmed by all impartial readers; nor must we forget to express our thanks to the distinguished person who has edited them; the notes, whether placed at the foot of the pages or in the appendix, are excellent, and every allusion to contemporary events is carefully and accurately explained.

M. Pierre Clément, known by many important and interesting works on the history of France at various epochs, had some time before his death begun to collect and publish all the despatches and State papers of Colbert.† This voluminous collection, the elements of which were gathered with much diligence from the French Record Office and the principal public libraries, was to be introduced by a life of the great French Minister, comprising an account of the administration of the finances during the reign of Louis XIV. A severe malady, intensified by the calamities of the late war, carried off M. Clément before he could finish his work, and it is his widow who now completes and publishes these two volumes, with the help of M. Geffroy, who has added an excellent preface on the character of Colbert's Government. It would not be difficult to show from contemporary evidence how much France was indebted to that distinguished statesman. His predecessor Fouquet, as M. Geffroy aptly remarks, may be regarded as the last feudal Minister, the last representative of a system which encouraged and sanctioned the most scandalous abuses. Colbert committed blunders, no doubt, and too often behaved in an arbitrary manner; but the present harmonious working of the French administrative machine can be traced back directly to his influence. M. Clément's interesting work gives the fullest details as to every branch of the public service, and it ends by a short explanation of the animosity which Colbert entertained against Louvois. Some writers have unjustly accused the former of systematic hatred towards Louvois. The charge is groundless; if Colbert felt it his duty to oppose his rival, it was merely because he thought that Louvois's harshness and overbearing manners were unnecessarily irritating to those with whom he had to do. The last chapter contains an account of Colbert's family affairs, the last years of his busy life, and his death; a copious index terminates the second volume.

The fifth volume of M. Taxile Delord's *Histoire du Second Empire*‡ begins with the year 1867, and takes us as far as the opening of the Council at the Vatican; the ground which it covers is therefore extremely varied, and as we traverse it we cannot help seeing evident signs of the approaching catastrophe. The death of the unfortunate Maximilian, the vain attempt on the part of the Emperor to introduce liberal reforms, the Geneva Congress and the organization of the International Society, M. Rochefort and the *Lanterne*, M. Sainte-Beuve and the question of the workmen's libraries—these are the principal episodes in this new volume. Although decidedly liberal in his views, and therefore free from all suspicion of sympathy with the Empire, M. Taxile Delord has no difficulty in showing that during the year 1869, and in fact throughout the whole reign of Napoleon III., the Republicans, especially the members of the Extreme Left, did their best to frighten the *bourgeoisie*, and to reconcile them to the Empire at the very time when the whole country was beginning to discover the approaching gloomy results of an absolutist policy. The Republican party, says M. Delord, has great qualities; perseverance, ardour, the spirit of self-sacrifice; but, on the other hand, it is characterized by two defects which account for its continual reverses; it is entirely destitute of political instinct, and it will never accommodate itself to the circumstances of the times. Whereas the leadership of the Democrats should be placed in the hands of wise and reasonable persons, it is left to bold but imprudent men who mistake *coup de théâtre* for political acts, and think that to

attitudinize is to assert their dignity. M. Delord illustrates this very forcibly by a description of M. Henri Rochefort's efforts as an agitator and a journalist.

M. Champfleury continues to write the history of caricature*, and the first instalment of his work just published bears upon the Revolution, the First Empire, and the Restoration. Subjects then abounded to exercise the ingenuity of the rough artists who desired to employ their pencils for the purpose of destroying abuses or bringing about reforms. The sufferings of the *tiers état* and its impatience to obtain an acknowledgment of its rights are cleverly portrayed, and the privileged orders are reminded that those alone who share the burdens of the State ought to participate in the benefits which a good Government brings along with it. As the political horizon becomes gloomier the caricatures assume a tragic appearance; then come portraits of distinguished leaders, such as Mounier, Mirabeau, Sieyès, Lafayette, &c.; the Royalists, attacked by the Liberals, defend themselves with the weapon of ridicule, and are often very successful. Not only do the humorous "counterfeit presentations" circulate in detached sheets, unaccompanied by letterpress; they also adorn the first pages of newspapers and gazettes. Camille Desmoulins has a witty frontispiece for his *Révolutions de France et de Brabant*; Peltier's *Actes des apôtres* in their turn exhibit amusing caricatures of Mme de Staël, Barnave, Grégoire, and all those who under the various shades of Liberalism were equally bent upon destroying the *ancien régime*. M. Champfleury has borrowed many woodcuts from Gillray and Rowlandson, of whose talents he speaks in the most favourable manner. Napoleon of course figures largely in these piquant productions, and the allied sovereigns tossing in a blanket the victor of Austerlitz is one of the best vignettes we have noticed.

The readable History of Rome for which we are indebted to M. Duruy has reached its fourth volume.† Nero opens the series, and we are led on step by step till we arrive at Marcus Aurelius. It is curious to compare M. Duruy's appreciation of the Roman Emperors with that given by the late M. Beulé, and to note the difference between the pamphlet-writer and the true historian. The judgment passed upon the family of Augustus in the volume now under notice is quite as severe as M. Beulé's, but it is not expressed in so violent a manner, nor does it display the *arrière-pensée* which is so characteristic of the brilliant political pamphlets composed by the Professor of Archaeology. M. Duruy has no favourable opinion of Seneca; he calls him a mere declaimer, and, quoting a remarkable expression of Caligula, he likens his writings to sand which no cement binds together. The state of the Christian Church during the second century, the attitude of heathenism towards it, and the policy of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, fill the concluding pages of M. Duruy's volume. Some persons have wondered that, with his exalted notions of morality, duty, and charity, Marcus Aurelius should have manifested such hatred against the Christians. Our author shows very clearly that, although his religious notions were, from the heathen point of view, distinguished by their singularity, yet Marcus Aurelius was to all intents and purposes a heathen. Toleration could be no part of his programme, for the reason that he did not share the scepticism of Hadrian, and the views of the Stoics on the government of the world, the principle of duty, and man's ultimate destiny, were directly opposed to those of Christianity. M. Duruy, on the whole, praises Marcus Aurelius, but only as a thinker, not as a ruler of men.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to give a complete history of art theoretically and practically in a small volume of two hundred pages, and yet M. William Reymond has attempted it.‡ After devoting a preliminary chapter to the principles of aesthetics, he takes a rapid survey of architecture, sculpture, and painting, in their various manifestations, from the earliest epoch to our own day, giving a short notice of the leading artists, and defining the character of the different styles which have succeeded each other in the world. M. Reymond maintains that the Greek, the Oriental, the Gothic, the Renaissance, and other schools, corresponding as they did to certain well-defined forms of civilization, had each its peculiar originality and justification, whereas the art of the nineteenth century lacks this essential quality, and is therefore below contempt. M. Reymond's book will be found useful as a guide to those who wish to have an elementary knowledge of the plastic arts, but it is necessarily very dry and colourless, and can serve only as a preface to more profound studies.

M. Laveleye must always command attention when discoursing about political economy, and his new book treats of a subject which is just now uppermost in every one's thoughts.§ A strange contrast is presented between the state of the public mind at present and what it was a century ago. The contemporaries of Rousseau and Voltaire were eager for reforms, and thoroughly convinced that man's innate goodness would bring about those reforms without any difficulty whatever. First of all eliminate the tyrants, do away with despotism, and then the reign of fraternity would begin. Unfortunately the progress of humanity has not been quite so unchecked as the prophets anticipated. Political abuses have been cleared away, it is true, but it is the existence of society itself which is now called in question, and the democracy of the nineteenth cen-

* *Mémoires de Malouet*. Publiées par son petit-fils, le baron Malouet. Paris: Plon.

† *Histoire de Colbert et de son administration*. Par M. P. Clément. Paris: Didier.

‡ *Histoire du Second Empire*. Par M. Taxile Delord. Vol. 5. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

* *Histoire de la Caricature sous la République, l'Empire, et la Restauration*. Par Champfleury. Paris: Dentu.

† *Histoire des Romains*. Par V. Duruy. Vol. 4. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

‡ *Histoire de l'Art*. Par William Reymond. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

§ *De la Propriété et de ses formes primitives*. Par E. de Laveleye. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

tury revives the pretensions which brought about the ruin of the Republics of classical antiquity. M. de Laveleye holds that, whilst the state of Europe just now offers the greatest affinity with the society of Greece and Rome in days of yore, yet our position is much more critical, owing to two causes which could not exist in the heathen world. The first of these causes is an economical one, arising from the fact that, whereas the present struggle between capital and labour leads to an industrial deadlock, formerly the quarrels between the rich and the proletariat did not stop the production of riches, as the labour was in all cases done by slaves. The second cause, according to M. de Laveleye, is the principle of Christianity which teaches us the universal brotherhood of mankind. If the religion of the Gospel were strictly carried out, he says, it would unavoidably lead to Socialism. The only way to prevent modern democracies from falling into the abyss which has swallowed the old ones is, he argues, to break up property into as many portions as possible, so that every one may have a share in proportion to his contributions to the general stock. Such is the leading axiom developed in M. de Laveleye's work, where the history of Rome, Greece, mediæval and modern Europe is carefully discussed from the point of view of property.

M. Sedillot wishes to raise his native country out of the mire, and to close, if possible, the era of fruitless and dangerous revolutions.* This, he believes, can be done only by an educational process which shall apply equally to all men's faculties, and restore their healthy action, making them work harmoniously together instead of multiplying divisions, contrasts, and contradictions. M. Sedillot thinks that science must be taken as the basis or starting point, because the number, variety, and antagonism of religions render it hopeless to think of inducing the whole community to accept the data of faith as postulates beyond the reach of contradiction. He acknowledges, at the same time, that the attempt to eliminate the metaphysical element is a mutilation of our nature, and that atheism is an impossibility. Some of the author's remarks are sound, and the whole book is written in a spirit of gentleness and conciliation which should commend it to an impartial thinker.

M. Baudrillart also discourses of education, but his volume is both wider in its range and less general in its plan than M. Sedillot's.† The author is struck by the fact that French society is a prey just now to what may be called the fever of *déclassement*; in other words, every one feels or fancies that he is out of his proper groove where circumstances have happened to put him, and aims at occupying a higher standing. The *Commune* of 1870-71 was in a great measure an attempt made by the *déclassés* of every kind to satisfy their long pent-up ambition, and the political question was a mere pretence to conceal and justify the lust of plunder and enjoyment. M. Baudrillart's introductory chapter is devoted to an account of the origin of the *Commune*, the social crisis which brought it about, and the general immorality of which it was a symptom. In order, he says, to prevent the recurrence of so terrible a catastrophe, there must be a reform of the educational system, beginning with the family circle. Wherever the influence of home is either null or dangerous, there may be a certain amount of instruction given, but there can be no education worthy of the name. It is accordingly incumbent upon the State to favour as much as possible the organization of the family amongst the working classes; and, on the other hand, the upper and middle strata of society must set the example of morality and religion to those whom circumstances have made their inferiors. M. Baudrillart insists very much upon the introduction of political economy and similar subjects into the programme of high-class schools, and he is no less earnest in recommending the prompt organization of parish schools for the purpose of giving to workmen the instruction best qualified to make them useful and honourable citizens. In discussing the part which women are to play as educators, M. Baudrillart is naturally led to examine Mr. John Stuart Mill's views on that important topic, and he shows that the English philosopher's fondness for abstract methods has induced him to ignore completely the moral side of social organization.

M. Delaunay ‡, honourably known already by a work on Philo Judeus, has given us, so to say, a companion volume to this treatise in the octavo we have now to notice. He explains, in the first place, the character of the three civilizations which helped to leaven the old European world; the Greeks, the Romans, and the Jews—the three Mediterranean nations—had an equal share in this gigantic task, and their combined action is still felt in modern society. If we wish to study Hellenic influence, we must visit Miletus, Syracuse, and Cumæ; Gaul, Asia, and Egypt help us best to understand the political genius of Rome; finally, the history of the colonial activity of the Jews, and of Alexandria, which was the centre of that activity, supplies the most trustworthy information respecting the relations of the children of Abraham with foreign Powers. To Alexandria therefore M. Delaunay invites us to follow him, and his book on the Sibylline oracles is intended to make us acquainted with the mystic side of Jewish philosophy. Monachism and prophecy, says our author, are two important elements in the development of Judæo-Alexandrine teaching; the former is a principle of internal action, the latter

is an agent of proselytism; and to each of them is assigned a division in this volume. After having considered the origin, the doctrines, and the rites of Hebrew monachism, dwelling particularly on the Essenes, and drawing a parallel between the asceticism which distinguished them and that of the early Christian Church, M. Delaunay gives us a French version of Philo's treatise on contemplative life. This curious work, the authenticity of which has been questioned by certain German critics, appeared during the sixteenth century in a translation by Pierre Bellier. A century later Bernard de Montfaucon applied himself to another work of the same kind, but the liberties he took with the original detracted considerably from the merit of his own version. M. Delaunay has thought it necessary therefore to enter the lists for the third time, and he has taken care to consult, as a preliminary step, the valuable MSS. of Philo preserved at Florence and Paris. The second part of the volume contains a full history of the Sibylline oracles, both those of Alexandrine origin and those which Greek poetry has handed down to us; and a translation of the Judæo-Alexandrine oracles terminates the book. We are bound to thank M. Delaunay for the satisfactory accomplishment of a work which must have cost him much labour, and which forms an excellent commentary on M. Alexandre's learned edition of the Sibylline fragments.

M. de Pressensé's remarks on religious liberty in Europe since 1870* is an *ouvrage de circonstance*, as the title sufficiently shows, and has been composed for the express purpose of showing the danger arising from the temporary (he hopes) eclipse of the great principles of religious freedom. We need not suppose for a moment that Roman Catholicism is the only section of the Christian Church which M. de Pressensé accuses of reviving the traditions of despotism; he is quite as angry against M. de Bismarck and the German Protestants, and he maintains that the necessity of resisting Ultramontanist aggressions does not justify the system of persecution which Prussia has had recourse to during the last few years. The recent triumphs of the Jesuits are, says M. de Pressensé, at the root of the crisis through which we are now passing, and with the help of new documents he gives us a curious chapter of contemporary Church history. The religious state of Austria and Switzerland next comes under consideration, and the explosion of the new Catholic schism enables our author to impart much interest to this part of his book. As we have already said, M. de Pressensé is the sworn enemy of despotism under whatever colours it stalks abroad, and his condemnation of it includes the Swiss demagogues and the Prussian pietists just as much as the champions of the Vatican. The separation of Church and State is the great aim he has in view, the principle towards which, he believes, society is steadfastly advancing; a true disciple of M. Vinet's school, he wants to see privileges entirely abolished, without considering for a moment whether he is not endeavouring to bring about an Utopian state of things which the very essence of Roman Catholicism renders impossible.

M. Adolphe Bouillet † has studied the French writers of the sixteenth century to some purpose, for his style is excellent, and his language has some of the picturesque qualities of Rabelais, Bonaventure, Despériers, and Montaigne; but we must say that he might have applied his undoubted merits as a writer to better subjects than political abuse and unjustifiable invective.

M. Fourcade Prunet, like M. Emile Zola, has undertaken to describe French society as it appeared during the reign of Napoleon III.‡ Taking as his motto a sentence of M. Alexandre Dumas, he paints in repulsive colours the last days of a civilization eaten up by corruption, and the characters he conjures up before us are unfortunately those with whom most readers would not care to be acquainted. Thus it is that in the hands of some writers even works of fiction have been forced into the service of contemporary politics, and that the events of the last few years are made to supply materials for sensational novels. M. Fourcade Prunet compares the French of the Second Empire with those of the Regency, when the Duke of Orleans and his *roués* had at their discretion the destinies of a great nation, and when the orgies of the Palais Royal had succeeded to the festivities of Versailles.

This parallel naturally leads us to notice the thirteenth volume of Saint-Simon's *Memoirs* §, just published, and treating precisely of that curious epoch. Whether the nineteenth century will ever be lucky enough to find a chronicler equal in depth, in power of style, and in vigour, to the wonderful man we have just named is a matter of doubt, but it is to be hoped that, if he comes, he will be less actuated by prejudice. Saint-Simon was essentially a good hater, and we need not go beyond the volume now before us to find conclusive proofs of his glaring want of justice. He makes of the Duke of Maine an embodiment of every possible vice, and he nearly ascribes to him the most heinous crimes. Alluding to the death of the Dauphin and of the Duke of Burgundy by poison, he clearly accuses the Duke of Maine of having poisoned them both—as clearly, at all events, as insinuations can do. He was too wary to bring forward against his *bête noire* a direct charge which he would have been unable to substantiate, but any one who reads his *Memoirs* cannot fail to see at once what were his real sentiments on the matter.

The life of Denis Papin has been related in a popular manner by

* *Du relèvement de la France*. Par le docteur C. Sedillot. Paris: Plon.

† *La famille et l'éducation en France, dans leurs rapports avec l'état de la société*. Par H. Baudrillart. Paris: Didier.

‡ *Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité Judéo-Grecque*. Par Ferdinand Delaunay. Paris: Didier.

* *La liberté religieuse en Europe depuis 1870*. Par E. de Pressensé. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher.

† *L'arnie de Henri V*. Par Ad. Bouillet. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

‡ *Une fin de monde*. Par Gaston Fourcade Prunet. Paris: Lévy.

§ *Mémoires du duc de Saint-Simon*. Vol. 13. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

Baron Ernout*, who gives by way of introduction a brief summary of the discoveries made in various countries in regard to the power of steam before the appearance of the great Huguenot *savant*. It is remarkable that ever since the year 1846 the French Government had contemplated a complete edition of Papin's works, and that the vicissitudes of political events have prevented this useful project from being carried out. Baron Ernout in his biographical sketch has been able to avail himself of the materials collected by MM. de la Saussaye and Péan, to whom the editing of Papin's writings was entrusted.

M. Gabriel Monod's interesting article on M. Michelet, and one by M. Tallichet on the question of labour and capital, are the most noteworthy items in the *Bibliothèque universelle* for July†; the admirers of true poetry will also like to read an essay on Mme. Desbordes Valmore, illustrated by plentiful quotations, selected with much care and discrimination.

* *Denis Papin, sa vie et son œuvre*. Par le baron Ernout. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

† *Bibliothèque universelle et Revue suisse*. Livraison de Juillet. Lausanne: Bridel.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 979, AUGUST 1, 1874:

French Finance. Spain. Public Works in India. The Irish Coercion Acts. The Worship Bill in Committee. The Debate on Dissolution. Canada and the United States. The National Gallery.

The Session. Scotch Satire. Roman Catholic Founders. Art Shop. The Ethics of Tyrannicide. Nice New Things in Companies. Co-operative Stores. Assize Business. The Committee on Explosives.

The Count of Paris's History of the American War. Burrow's Worthies of All Souls. Smith's Mohammed and Mohammedanism. Montégut's Burgundy. Rose and Rue. Mrs. Cooper's Life of Stratford. Birch's Country Architecture. French Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. 978, JULY 25, 1874:

Ministers at the Mansion House—The Russian Government and the Rules of War—The Endowed Schools Bill—The Fiji Islands—Marshall MacMahon and the Republic—Election Petitions—The Lords' Committee on Church Patronage—Public Opinion and the Indian Famine.

Collections—The Man and Dog Fight—Two more Days on the Berkshire Downs—"Bloody Gardiner"—Life Assurance—Rational Law-Making—Prosecution of the Jockey Club—The Italian Opera.

erica, Ancient and Modern—Froude's English in Ireland. Vol. III.—Rendu on Glaciers—Young Brown—The Seven Ages of a Village Pauper—Joan of Arc and the Times of Charles the Seventh—Waldried—Burbridge's Domestic Floriculture—American Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

WILL SHORTLY CLOSE.

"THE SHADOW OF DEATH."—Painted by Mr. HOLMAN. HUNT in Bethlehem, Jerusalem, and Nazareth (begun in 1865, completed end of 1872). NOW ON VIEW at 30a Old Bond Street. The Gallery is opened at Ten, closed at Six. Admittance, 1s.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE OF "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," with "The Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Night of the Crucifixion," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Andromeda," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Ten to Six.—Admission, 1s.

MUNICH GALLERY.—EXHIBITION OF PICTURES by KAULBACH, PILLOT, SCHÖN, COBRADER, OTTO, &c. Admission, 1s.—45 Great Marlborough Street, Regent Street, W.

KAULBACH'S celebrated GREAT PICTURES, "St. Peter Arbues Dooming a Heretic Family to the Flames," and "James V. of Scotland opening the Parliament in Edinburgh." Open daily from Ten till Six. Admission 1s.—MUNICH GALLERY, 45 Great Marlborough Street, Regent Street.

SOCIAL SCIENCE CONGRESS, GLASGOW, September 30 to October 7.

President—The Right Hon. Earl of ROSEBURY.

Presidents of Departments.

JURISPRUDENCE—The Right Hon. Lord MONCRIEFF (Lord Justice Clerk of Scotland). EDUCATION—The Right Hon. Lord NAPIER and ETTRICK, K.T. HEALTH—The Right Hon. LYON PLAYFAIR, C.B., F.R.S., M.P. ECONOMY—Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL. REPRESSION OF CRIME SECTION—FREDERIC HILL, Esq. COUNCIL—G. W. HASTINGS, Esq.

Prospectuses and Particulars may be had on application at the Office, 1 Adam Street, Adelphi, W.C.

C. W. RYALLS, General Secretary.

JERSEY.—ST. AUBIN'S SCHOOL. Head-Master—Mr. J. E. VIBERT, M.A., M.C.P. Genial climate. Healthy situation. Special attention to Modern Languages. Prospectuses on application.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL and COLLEGE.

SCHOLARSHIPS IN SCIENCE.

Two Scholarships in Science have been founded at St. Bartholomew's Hospital: 1. An Open Scholarship of the value of £100, tenable for one year, to be competed for in September. The Subjects of Examination are Physics, Chemistry, Botany, and Zoology. The Successful Candidate will be required to enter at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in October next. 2. Preliminary Scientific Scholarship of the value of £50, tenable for one year, to be competed for in October next, by Students of the Hospital of less than six months' standing. The Subjects of Examination are identical with those of the Open Scholarship. For further particulars and syllabus of subjects, application may be made, personally or by letter, to THE WARDEN of the College, St. Bartholomew's Hospital.

INDIAN CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE.—The following are some of the SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES at the recent open competition for admission to the Indian Civil Engineering College, Cooper's Hill, Surrey:

No. in Order of Merit.	Name.	Total of Marks.
12.	De Brath, Stanley ..	2,176.
13.	Ivens, J. H. Anderson ..	2,141.
21.	Rome, Walter ..	1,865.
32.	Darling, W. Algron ..	1,840.
39.	Malet, Allen A. G. ..	1,630.
36.	Usher, Christopher J. ..	1,568.
40.	Lambert, G. Buchanan ..	1,526.

Pupils of Mr. J. ASHTON, 84 King Henry's Road, South Hampstead, who prepares resident and non-resident Candidates.

PRIVATE TUITION FOR ARMY, COOPER'S HILL, CIVIL SERVICE, WOOLWICH.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES (Wrag. Cam.), has passed over 300 and occasionally has VACANCIES.—Castlebar Court, Ealing, W.

EDUCATION at ZÜRICH.—Mr. F. DE BAUDISS, formerly one of the Assistant-Masters at Wellington College, receives a limited number of PUPILS, and will have Vacancies in October. The House is healthily situated, and the style of living is arranged to suit English habits. Mr. DE BAUDISS is assisted by competent Masters, and is able to offer, in addition to French and German and the usual subjects of a liberal education, special facilities for the study of Physical and Mechanical Science. Advanced Pupils have the opportunity of attending the Lectures of the Polytechnic School on Engineering, Agriculture, and other branches of Applied Science.—For terms and references apply to F. DE BAUDISS, Viscontarasse, Seefeld, Zürich.

AN OXFORD GRADUATE, in Honours, an old Marlburian, and late Scholar of his College, receives PUPILS.—Address, Rev. W. EMMA, Great Blakenham, Ipswich.

A MARRIED CLERGYMAN, Incumbent of a Small Parish near Oxford, formerly Tutor in several Families of Distinction, and late Master in a Public School, receives Three or Four PUPILS to prepare for the University. Terms £200. References given and required.—Address, Rev. M. A. OXON, care of Messrs. Masters & Co., 79 New Bond Street, London.

66 AVENUE ROAD, London, N.W.—The Rev. NATHANIEL JENNINGS, M.A., receives STUDENTS for UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, or Pupils for its School, and assists them in preparing for their Classes. The Metropolitan Railway makes the College easily accessible in all kinds of weather. Terms on application.

THE Rev. L. HENSLEY, Vicar of Hitchin, Herts, formerly Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge, receives several PUPILS to prepare for the Universities, and has VACANCIES for September 7.

BACKWARD PUPILS from ETON, HARROW, &c.—A GENTLEMAN, successful in coaching for the above Schools, desires a HOLIDAY ENGAGEMENT (Continental or otherwise). Testimonials from Noblemen and Gentlemen.—ALPHA, Winter's Library, Kensington, W.

BRIGHTON COLLEGE.—The FRENCH and GERMAN MASTER, Mr. C. H. WALL, receives BOARDERS. French is always spoken, and can be thoroughly taught without interruption to other work. The College instruction is supplemented by House Teaching. Special care is given to young Boys intended for the Army, Civil Service, &c. Arrangements can be made for the holidays. College and Boarding-house Fees, Eighty to Ninety Guineas. Mr. WALL has been Eleven years at the College.

PUPILS WANTED.—MACLURE & MACDONALD, Lithographers to the Queen, having completed their new and spacious buildings in Queen Victoria Street, to which they have now removed, have VACANCIES for a few well-educated young Gentlemen as PUPILS. Applications, with specimens showing capacity, and stating age, may be made to the above address. A moderate premium will be required.—Turret Printing Offices.

SUMMER TRIP TO GERMANY and BACK in a WEEK, allowing time for a visit to the Harz Mountains, Palace of Wilhelmshöhe, &c.—One of the North German Lloyd's Steamers leave Brunswick Wharf, Blackwall, every Wednesday and Saturday, 3 P.M.; Children under 10 years are despatched from London, Midland docks, for years at Half-fare.—Apply at Chaplin's Universal Office, Regent Circus, Piccadilly, W.1. or to Phillips, Graves, Phillips, & Co., St. Dunstan's House, Cross Lane, Great Tower Street, London, E.C., and 25 South John Street, Liverpool.

SUMMER TRIP TO HOLLAND and BACK in FOUR DAYS, allowing time for a visit to the interesting Cities of Amsterdam, Haarlem, Hague, Scheveningen, or Utrecht. The Favourite Steamers *Batavier* and *Maasduper* leave London alternately every Wednesday and Saturday for Rotterdam, embarking Passengers from Brunswick Wharf, Blackwall. Return Fares: Saloon, £1 14s.; Fore Cabin, £1 4s. 6d. including Steward's Fee, but exclusive of Provisions supplied on board.—Apply at Chaplin's Universal Office, Regent's Circus, W.1. or to Phillips, Graves, Phillips, & Co., St. Dunstan's House, Cross Lane, Great Tower Street, E.C.

SUMMER TRIP TO SWEDEN and BACK in SEVEN DAYS, allowing time for a visit to the magnificent Waterfalls at Trollhättan, the beautiful lakes Wenern and Vättern, with unrivalled surrounding scenery. The twin screw-steamers *Louisa-Jon*, *Kenny* and *Merry* are despatched from London, Midland docks, for Gothenburg every Friday alternately. Fare: Saloon, £3 3s.; Return Ticket, available for one month, £1 14s. 6d. Provisions obtainable on board at tariff prices.—Apply at Chaplin's Universal Office, Regent's Circus, W.1. or to Phillips, Graves, Phillips, & Co., St. Dunstan's House, Cross Lane, Great Tower Street, E.C.

MIDLAND RAILWAY.—TOURIST ARRANGEMENTS, 1874. Arrangements for the issue of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Class Tourist Tickets will be in force from May 16 to October 31, 1874. For particulars, see Time Tables and Programmes, issued by the Company. Derby, May 1874. JAMES ALLPORT, General Manager.

SANATORIUM.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill. Physician—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D., Edin. For Invalids and those requiring rest and change. Turkish Baths on the premises.

COMPRESSED AIR BATH.—An important Remedy in various forms of Asthma, Bronchial Affections, Disorders of the Lungs, and Anæmic conditions of the Blood.—TOWNSEND HOUSE, GREAT MALVERN. Physicians—R. B. GRINDROP and C. F. GRINDROP.

HERTFORDSHIRE.—To BE SOLD a Highly Important FREEHOLD RESIDENTIAL ESTATE, of over 800 acres, near to a first-class Station, about one hour from Town, comprising a magnificent Elizabethan Mansion, erected by the present owner in the most substantial and costly manner, and standing in a finely-timbered Park. It presents an imposing elevation, and is finished and fitted in all respects with great taste, and with the most elaborate adherence to uniformity of style. The Reception Rooms form a fine suite of apartments of admirable dimensions, most conveniently arranged to suit the requirements of a Family of rank or distinction. The Bedroom accommodation is suitable for a large establishment, and the Offices are spacious and well arranged. The Mansion is surrounded by charmingly laid-out Gardens and Pleasure Grounds of considerable extent, adorned with choice specimen Shrubs and stately Timber. The Kitchen Gardens are extensive, and there are all necessary Greenhouses, Vineries, Forcing Pits, &c., upon the most modern and improved plans. The Stabling is unusually good, and is well adapted for accommodating a large Stud, with extensive Coachhouses and Rooms for Servants. Also a superior modern Bailiff's House, with Model Homestead, Entrance Lodge, and other requirements suitable to an Estate of this character. The whole of the Premises are supplied with pure water from an Artesian Well, and are also supplied with Gas made on the property. The Land is partly grass and partly arable of a very productive character, studded with fine Timber, giving to the whole a park-like character, and adding greatly to the picturesque views to be obtained from the Mansion. There is first-class Shooting on the Estate, and excellent Hunting in the neighbourhood, and there are some noted Fox Coverts on the property. The Estate is admirably adapted for the requirements of any Gentleman desirous of obtaining a noble Residential Estate conferring a position in the County, involving no outlay whatever in improvements, repairs, or additions, as the Mansion is in the most perfect order and fit for immediate occupation. There is a portion of the Estate which might be separated for Building purposes without in any degree injuring the residential character of the property, and land similarly situated is of high and increasing value in the neighbourhood.—For further particulars, and for Orders for Admission, apply to Messrs. LORTS & WARNER, Estate Agents, 99 Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W.